

THE
CLASSICAL
REVIEW

Toronto University Library

Presented by

David Nutt Esquire

through the Committee formed in

The Old Country

to aid in replacing the loss caused by

The disastrous Fire of February the 14th 1890

THE
CLASSICAL
REVIEW.

VOLUME I.

London:
DAVID NUTT, 270 STRAND.
1887.

RICHARD CLAY AND SONS,
LONDON AND BUNGAY.

46 s-2
23/8/90 3v.

PA
1
C7
v. 1

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

No. 1.

	PAGE		PAGE
Editorial.	1	University Intelligence—	
Myron's <i>Pristae</i> . A. S. MURRAY . . .	3	Oxford	21
On some Political Terms Employed in		Cambridge	23
the New Testament. E. L. HICKS .	4	Obituary—	
The Greek and Latin Classics and		H. Jordan, E. Desjardins, G. H.	
English Literature. A. SIDGWICK . .	8	Heslop	24
Reviews—		Report on Archaeology. CECIL SMITH .	25
Jebb's Introduction to the <i>Iliad</i> and		Summaries of Periodicals—	
Odyssey. W. LEAF	12	Mnemosyne	27
Paley and Sandys' <i>Demosthenes</i> . W.		Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift	28
WAYTE	14	Rheinisches Museum	28
Mayor's <i>Juvenal</i> . H. NETTLESHIP .	15	Zeitschrift für das Gymnasialwesen .	29
Bücheler's <i>Juvenal</i> and <i>Persius</i> . R.		Philologus.	29
ELLIS	17	Philologischer Anzeiger	29
Shorter Notices—		Journal of Philology	30
Bender's Greek Literature.	19	Expositor	30
Gertz' <i>Seneca</i>	19	New Books—	
Notes—		English.	30
Greek Frogs.	20	Foreign.	31
The Vases from Thera.	20		
New Materials for the Text of			
Aristotle's <i>Politics</i>	20		

Nos. 2 and 3.

The Late Master of Trinity as a Platonic		Jevons' Athenian Democracy. A. H.	
Scholar. R. D. ARCHER HIND . . .	33	COOKE	58
The Aeolic Element in the <i>Iliad</i> and		Mommsen's <i>Römische Geschichte</i> .	
Odyssey. G. C. WARR	35	Vol. V. E. G. HARDY.	60
Early Classical MSS. in the British		Brugmann's Comparative Grammar.	
Museum. E. MAUNDE THOMPSON . .	38	T. C. SNOW	62
The Reformed Pronunciation of Latin.		Some Points of Roman Law in Tyr-	
J. P. POSTGATE.	40	rell's Letters of Cicero. H. J.	
On Some Political Terms Employed in		ROBY.	66
the New Testament. Part II. E. L.		Shorter Notices—	
HICKS	42	Greek Testament. Scrivener—Wey-	
On Some Faults in Milton's Latin		mouth	70
Poetry. C. WORDSWORTH	46	St. John's First Epistle. Lias . . .	71
Reviews—		St. Paul's Epistles. Pulpit Com-	
Leaf's <i>Iliad</i> . W. W. MERRY	49	mentary.	71
Verrall's <i>Septem contra Thebas</i> . R.		Adam's <i>Platonis Apologia</i>	71
Y. TYRRELL	50	Colbeck's <i>Caesar</i>	72
Jebb's <i>Oedipus Coloneus</i> . A. W.		Rawlins' <i>Livy</i>	72
VERRALL	53	Peskett's <i>Cicero's Second Philippic</i> .	72
Friedländer's <i>Martial</i> . J. E. B. MAYOR	56	Thomas' <i>Speeches of Cicero</i>	72

Shorter Notices—*continued*.

Gasquy's Cicéron Jurisconsulte . . .	73
Haverfield's Relief Map of Syracuse .	73
Sidgwick's Greek Prose	73
Kennedy's Latin Vocabulary	74
Gretton's Classical Coincidences . .	74
Upcott's Greek Sculpture	74
Baehrens' Fragmenta Poetarum . . .	74
Gilbert's Martial	74
Quaestiones Musonianae	74
Ruehl's Justin	76
Peiper's Ausonius	75
Baehrens' Minucius Felix	75
Brown's From Schola to Cathedral .	75
Greek Iambics. G. DENMAN	75

University Intelligence	77
Notes—	
Demosthenes in <i>Androt.</i> p. 606, § 44	77
Scholia on the <i>Plutus</i> of Aristophanes	78
Rutilius Claudius Namatianus, II.	
47, 8	78
Derivation of 'Stilus'	78
'Επιστημασία	79
Plautus, <i>Mil. Gl.</i> 695, Ceraria . . .	79
The Mausoleum	79
Report on Archaeology	80
Correspondence—J. C. COLLINS . . .	83
Summaries of Periodicals	83
Bibliography	88
Scholarships, &c.	89

No. 4.

The Aeolic Element in the Iliad and Odyssey. G. C. WARR	91
Schmidt's Studies on the Greek Dra- matists. R. C. JEBB	93
Blaydes' Aristophanes. D. S. MARGO- LIOUTH	96
Welldon's Rhetoric of Aristotle. G. M. EDWARDS	98
Two Books on Pausanias. H. F. TOZER	101
Wheeler on Greek Accentuation. J. PEILE	103
Lexicons to the Greek Testament. T. K. ABBOTT	106
Arnold's Second Punic War. A. S. WILKINS	109
Hadoardus' Excerpts from Cicero. J. S. REID	110

Huxley's Cicero	111
Lexicons to Caesar. J. E. B. MAYOR .	111
Cluer's Livy. H. M. STEPHENSON . .	112
Freeman's Lectures. E. G. HARDY . .	112
Laurie on the History of Universities.	
CHR. WORDSWORTH	112
Zompolides' Course of Modern Greek.	
M. C. DAWES	113
Carmen Saeculare. E. D. STONE . . .	114
Notes—	
Aristoph. <i>Acharn.</i> 36	115
Eur. <i>Ion.</i> 978. Eur. <i>Ion.</i> 1027 . . .	115
Archaic Fibulae with Incised Designs	115
University Intelligence (Dublin) . .	115
Report on Archaeology. CECIL SMITH .	117
Summaries of Periodicals	119
Bibliography	122

Nos. 5 and 6.

Johan Nicolai Madvig. J. E. B. MAYOR	123
The Conditional Sentence in Latin. E. A. SONNENSCHN	124
Aristophanica. R. Y. TYRRELL . . .	128
Some School Editions of Greek Plays .	
A. W. VERRALL	132
Texts of Cicero. J. S. REID	135
The Vienna Corpus Scriptorum Eccle- siasticorum. W. SANDAY	139
Palaeography in France. E. MAUNDE THOMPSON	145

Engelhardt on Latin Conjugation. A. S. WILKINS	147
Boeckh's Public Economy of Athens.	
L. C. PURSER	149
Pomtow's Poetae Lyrici Graeci. J. W. MACKAIL	152
Stock's Nicomachean Ethics. H. RICH- ARDS	152
Holden's Plutarch. W. W. FOWLER . .	152
Sidgwick's Georgics. F. C.	153
Person's Tacitus. H. FURNEAUX . . .	154

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

v

Godley's Tacitus. E. G. HARDY	154	French Translation of Mommsen's Staatsrecht. W. M. FOWLER	165
Juvenal by Pearson and Strong. J. D. DUFF	154	Herford's Studies. CHR. WORDSWORTH	166
Schenk's Texts—		Sicard's Études Classiques. CHR. WORDSWORTH	167
Meister's Quintilian. J. E. B. MAYOR.	155	Correspondence of Rhenanus	167
Holder's Herodotus. R. W. MACAN.	156	Jadart's Memoirs of Ruinart	168
Ovid. S. G. OWEN	157	Experiments in Archaic Greek Verse. G. C. WARR	168
Bruns' Fontes. H. J. ROBY	157	Notes—	
Marold's Juvenius	158	C. Julius Caesar. E. V. ARNOLD . .	168
Wagener's Festus	158	Vergil's <i>Alta Prochyta</i> . J. H. ABRAHALL	169
Petschenig's Corippus	158	Horace, <i>C.</i> iii. 23. T. E. PAGE . .	169
Huemer's Virgilius Grammaticus . .	158	Livy and Appian. P. GILES	170
Monumenta Germaniae Historica . .	158	Astragalizontes of Polycletus. R. C. SEATON	170
Translations of the Odyssey into English Verse	159	Announcements	170
Two books of Modern Latin Verse . .	161	University Intelligence—	
Darmesteter. La Vie des Mots. J. E. KING	161	Oxford	171
Cagnat on Latin Epigraphy. F. HAVERFIELD	162	Cambridge	171
Havet on Greek and Latin Metre. C. B. HEBERDEN	162	Archaeology—	
Usener on Early Greek Metres. G. C. WARR	162	Head's <i>Historia Numorum</i> . ARTHUR J. EVANS	171
Latin Alphabet and Pronunciation by Édou. W. M. LINDSAY	163	Klein's Greek Vases. CECIL TORR .	176
Beloch on the population of the Graeco-Roman World. L. WHIBLEY	164	Notes and Summaries	176
Schulthess on the Attic law of Guardianship. H. HAGER	165	Obituary	178
		Summaries of Periodicals	178
		Bibliography	182
		Scholarships, &c.	183

No. 7.

Scott's Fragmenta Herculaneisia. E. L. HICKS	185	Church's Carthage. W. W. F.	204
Ellis' Avianus. J. E. B. MAYOR . . .	188	Notes—	
Studia Biblica. T. K. ABBOTT	194	Aeschyl. <i>Agam.</i> 301. A. PALLIS . .	204
The Conditional Sentence in Latin. H. J. ROBY	197	Aristophanes, <i>Ach.</i> 100. <i>Vesp.</i> 355. D. S. M.	204
Texts of Homer. W. LEAF	198	Aristotelian Fragments	205
Homeric Dialect. D. B. MONRO . . .	199	Stritauos—Tritauos. J. PEILE . . .	205
Simmons' Metamorphoses of Ovid. S. G. OWEN	199	Translation of Lesbia's Sparrow . .	205
French Latin Grammars—		Classical Education in France. Letter from a French University Professor .	205
Édou's Lhomond. E. A. S.	200	University Intelligence. Oxford. Cambridge	208
Reinach. E. A. S.	200	Archaeology—	
Riemann's Syntax. H. J. R.	201	Acquisitions of the British Museum .	209
Classical Antiquities—		Notes from Egypt. W. F. PETRIE . .	209
Daremberg and Saglio. J. E. B. M. .	201	Thasiote Tombs. J. T. BENT	210
Baumeister's Denkmäler. W. WROTH	202	Revue Archéologique	211
Neumann and Partsch on the Geography of Greece. M. G. GLAZEBROOK . . .	203	Bulletin de Corresp. Hellénique . .	211
Mahaffy's Alexander's Empire. W. W. FOWLER	203	Summaries of Periodicals	212
		Bibliography	214
		University Lists	215

No. 8.

Proposed scheme for a classical catalogue of MSS. of Classical Authors.	217
Weil's Demosthenes. S. H. BUTCHER.	218
Causeret's Rhetoric of Cicero. J. E. SANDYS.	222
Knoell's Eugippius. W. SANDAY.	224
An Appeal in behalf of the Archiv für Lateinische Lexikographie. JOHN E. B. MAYOR.	227
Martin's Les Cavaliers Athéniens. W. WYSE.	228
Chatelain's Paléographie. E. M. THOMPSON.	230
Geare's Thucydides.	231
Plato and M. Aurelius for English readers.	232
Zeller and Bonitz on Plato.	232
Caesar, B. G. By Bond and Walpole.	233
————— By C. Bryans.	233
Ovid's Tristia. By S. G. OWEN.	234
Bergk's Kleine philologische Schriften. F. B. JEVONS.	234
Lias' First Epistle to the Corinthians.	235
F. H. Woods and J. O. Johnston's Anti-Pelagian Treatises of St. Augustine.	235
Regnier's Latinity of Augustine's Sermons. J. E. B. MAYOR.	235
Chase's Chrysostom. A. PLUMMER.	236
Plummer's Church of the Early Fathers.	237
Three Books of Travel in Greece. H. F. TOZER.	237

Notes.

The Latin Conditional Sentence. E. A. SONNENSCHNIG and others.	238
Soph. <i>El.</i> 564, Eur. <i>I. T.</i> 15, 35. A. E. HOUSMAN.	240
Aesch. <i>Ag.</i> 1227, 1310, Eur. <i>Or.</i> 399. J. B. BURY.	241
On the Scholia of the <i>Plutus</i> . W. G. RUTHERFORD.	242
Caesar's Bridge. H. J. ROBY.	242
Hor. <i>Epod.</i> xvii. 32. J. H. ONIONS.	242
Macrob. <i>Sat.</i> vii. 4, 7.	243
Apsyrtus.	243
Difficulties in Juvenal. H. M. STEPHENSON.	243
Mommsen on the German Legions. E. G. HARDY.	243
On the word γλυφίδες. R. C. SEATON.	244
Δίκαιον. M. R. JAMES.	244
<i>Cavillor</i> . F. HAVERFIELD.	244
John Clement.	244
"To pour oil upon troubled waters."	245
Letter on Classical Education in France.	245
University Intelligence. Dublin.	247
Archaeology—	
Coins of Peloponnesus. C. W. C. OMAN.	248
Torr's Modern Rhodes. H. F. TOZER.	249
Notes and Summaries.	250
Summaries and Periodicals.	253
Bibliography.	260

No. 9.

Windisch, Georg Curtius. A. S. WILKINS.	263
Schiller's History of the Empire. H. F. PELHAM.	266
Studia Biblica. (II.) T. K. ABBOTT.	268
Paley's Truth about Homer. T. C. SNOW.	269
Abel's Orphica. J. H. LUPTON.	270
Wotke's Demosthenes. J. E. SANDYS.	271
Crusius, Plutarchi De Proverbiis. W. R. ROBERTS.	272
Blass, Eudoxus, T. L. HEATH.	272
Schwartz, Scholia in Euripidem. J. B. BURY.	272
Bethe on the Mythology of Diodorus. J. B. BURY.	273
Briel, De Callistrato et Philonide. W. G. RUTHERFORD.	273
Poiret's Éloquence judiciaire à Rome pendant la République. J. E. NIXON.	273

Vergil's Culex. ROBINSON ELLIS.	274
Güthling's Vergil. S. G. OWEN.	276
Keene's Calpurnius.	276
Ramsay's Propertius and Tibullus.	276
Editions of Livy by Madvig and Zingerle. H. M. STEPHENSON.	276
Knoke, Die Kriegzüge des Germanicus. H. FURNEAUX.	277
Boelte's De Artium Scriptoribus Latinis. H. NETTLESHIP.	278
Austrian Staff Maps of Greece. M. G. GLAZEBROOK.	279
Oberhammer's Akarnania. M. G. GLAZEBROOK.	279
Nettleship, Passages for Latin translation.	279
Notes.	
ἀσπὸς and αὐτός. T. G. TUCKER.	280
On the meaning of ἀπειρή. Philostratus. ARTHUR PLATT.	280

Tischendorf on the <i>Cod. Palatinus</i> . W. SANDAY.	281	Archaeology—	
Two MSS. at Patmos. J. A. ROBINSON.	281	Budge and Torr, Catalogue of Gardner Wilkinson Collection. C. SMITH .	285
Third Letter on Classical Education in France. By a French University Pro- fessor.	282	Archaeological Notes and Summaries. C. SMITH.	286
University Intelligence. Oxf. & Camb.	285	Summaries of Periodicals.	288
		Bibliography.	291

No. 10.

Haskins' Lucan. H. NETTLESHIP . . .	293	A Dedication, from the Echoes of Hellas. G. C. WARR	309
A. Müller's Greek Theatre. H. HAGER and R. C. JEBB	296	Supplement to the Aulularia. T. G. TUCKER	310
Gomme's Romano-British Remains, Part I. F. HAVERFIELD	298	Notes.	
Vahlen's Longinos. J. B. BURY . . .	300	Pindar, <i>Nem.</i> vii. 17. W. RIDGWAY	313
Funk's Didache. C. MERK	302	Aesch. <i>Num.</i> 631. G. C. WARR . .	313
Holzinger's Nemesius. J. E. B. M. . .	303	Aristophanes, <i>Ranae</i> 1028. R. Y. TYRRELL	313
Chaignet's Métrique Grecque. C. B. HEBERDEN	303	History of a Bas-relief. T. K. ABBOTT	313
Carmina Figurata Graeca. C. B. HEBERDEN	304	<i>Parum Cavisse Videtur.</i> J. E. B. M.	313
Schoell's Captivi and Rudens. J. H. ONIONS	304	University Intelligence. Oxford and Cambridge	314
Two Editions of Cicero De Oratore. A. S. WILKINS	306	Archaeology—	
Sonntag's Appendix Vergiliana. R. ELLIS	306	The Lygdamis Inscription. E. M. THOMPSON	314
Dosson's Curtius. W. E. HEITLAND .	307	An Archaic Greek Vase. A. S. MURRAY	315
Reitzenstein's Verrianiſche Forschun- gen. H. NETTLESHIP	307	Acquisitions of British Museum . .	316
Mélanges Renier. W. RHYS ROBERTS .	308	Notes and Summaries	318
Stedman's Latin Examination Papers. A. S.	309	Tümpel on the Myth of Andromeda C. TORR	318
Extracts for Translation. A. S. . . .	309	Summaries of Periodicals	319
		Bibliography	322

ERRATA.

Page 301, col. *b*, last line but three, for *δεῖ* read *θεῖ*.

Page 306, col. *a*, third line in notice of Cicero, for 'no independent' read 'an independent.'

The Classical Review

MARCH 1887.

EDITORIAL.

THE general aim of the promoters of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW has been already explained in a Prospectus which has been widely circulated; but it may be well in our first number briefly to recapitulate what was there stated as to the scope of the Review, and to point more directly to the results which we hope may follow from its establishment.

As regards its subject-matter, the Review will deal with all that concerns the language, life, and literature of Greece and Rome down to the year 800 A.D. in the case of the Western, and the year 1453 A.D. in the case of the Eastern Empire, as well as with the history of classical scholarship up to the present time. Oriental languages and history, and general or comparative philology, will be included only in so far as they are directly related to the languages and history of Greece and Rome. But the Review will embrace all that is written in Greek and Latin down to the dates above mentioned, without regard to the distinction commonly made between sacred and profane literature.

It is evident that it will be necessary to define our subject still further if it is to be brought within reasonable compass, so as to admit of thorough treatment in the pages of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW. This limitation we hope to gain, in the first place, by taking as our starting point and chief concern the interpretation of the ancient texts. We do not propose to deal with Philosophy, or Law Theology, or in the abstract, but with their literary basis. Thus Theology, so far as it enters into our plan, will be not speculative or systematic, but mainly critical or exegetical. Another limitation will arise out of our manner of treating the subject. Our aim is not so much to provide original matter as to supply an index and chronicle of all that is being done in the field of Classical Antiquity as above defined.

It is thought that a publication based on these lines will supply a real want which has long been felt in this country. Whereas in Germany there are more than twenty periodicals devoted to the exclusive study of Classical Antiquity, some of them coming out as often as once a week, English scholarship has produced up to the present time no single periodical of frequent or even regular issue which devotes itself to the different requirements of classical students. For notes and news of classical and archæological interest, as well as for reviews of classical books, scholars have had to depend almost entirely on the journals of general literature, in which only a very limited space could be allotted to any special department.

We hope then to make THE CLASSICAL REVIEW a critical record of the work of the year, so far as regards English publications, by noticing within three months of their

appearance, all that are not unmistakable cram-books or of a merely elementary character: and in regard to foreign publications, by independent notices of the more important books, and by short summaries of the various philological, archæological, and theological reviews so far as they fall within the province marked out; attention will also be called to articles or paragraphs of interest to classical scholars which may be found in other publications. In regard to unprinted matter, information will be given by Correspondence from our own and from foreign universities, by Reports of Exploration and Discovery, and in other ways.

A further use of the Review will be to serve as a receptacle for notes and queries and adversaria of any kind. It constantly happens that a scholar in the course of his studies makes an emendation or strikes out a new interpretation of a disputed passage, or lights upon an interesting illustration, or discovers inaccuracies in some work of authority; yet nothing comes of his discoveries because he does not know where to send them. We hope that *THE CLASSICAL REVIEW* may become the natural depositary of such fragments of knowledge, each perhaps apparently unimportant in itself, but in the aggregate capable of leading to results of great interest and value. At present there is perhaps no country which produces so large an annual crop of scholars, with so small a comparative result in the shape of permanent contributions to classical learning, as our own.

Again, we shall hope, at least until our pages are fully occupied in the ways above described, to insert short original articles, which will usually be of a less elaborate kind than those which are admitted in the existing philological journals. Such articles will from time to time be especially adapted to the requirements of younger scholars.

To sum up briefly the benefits we anticipate from the establishment of *THE CLASSICAL REVIEW*, if we succeed in carrying out the above programme: they are first, that writers will no longer work in the dark, as they have too often done in former times, but will at any rate have an opportunity of ascertaining what is being done abroad, and will also have the satisfaction of knowing that their own work will be tested by competent critics within a reasonable period of time; secondly, that schoolmasters and others interested in education will learn what books to recommend to their pupils, and may perhaps gather hints as to improved methods of teaching from our foreign correspondence; thirdly, we hope to turn wasted power to account by inducing some who are at present unproductive scholars to take a more active part in promoting the advancement of learning; fourthly, perhaps it is not too much to hope that some who have been prejudiced against classical education may chance to cast their eye on these pages and discover that to classical scholars at any rate 'Classics' means something more than writing verses in a dead language, though even for that much-decried accomplishment we think there is something to be said, and indeed propose to give occasional specimens of it in our columns. Lastly, we hope that *THE CLASSICAL REVIEW* may be used as an organ of intercommunication between scholars in all parts of the world, and thus foster the feeling that all are engaged in a common work, and enable each to profit by the experience of others.

It must, of course, take time before the ideal of a Classical Review here shadowed forth can approach to realization. But the editors believe that it is perfectly capable of being realized, and that in proportion as it is so, it will tend very greatly to improve the condition of classical learning in England.

The Classical Review.

MYRON'S PRISTAE.

THE sculptor Myron is credited by Pliny¹ with certain works in bronze, among which are figures of *pristae*. By a misunderstanding these *pristae* were long considered to be sea-monsters. It is now held that they could have been nothing else than 'sawyers of wood,' and since the notion of a number of disconnected figures in the attitude of sawyers is contrary to modern views about Greek sculpture of the higher order, recourse has been had to the reasonable idea of a group of two sawyers at work. It would be easy to conceive such a group in bas-relief, if that were admissible, as it is not; for Myron is only known to have worked in the round. But a group of sawyers, executed in the round, would present a spectacle for which there is nothing to prepare us among the remains of Greek sculpture. The saw and the piece of wood are elements in the design which cannot be reconciled with the principles of Greek statuary; and yet they are necessary elements. As the matter now stands, it is admitted that the *pristae* were a group of sawyers, but as yet no copy, or other trace of them than in Pliny, has been found.²

Believing that the strict interpretation of *pristae* as sawyers lands us in an impossible group, I propose to argue that this word may have been applied also to a game in which the process of sawing was imitated in some measure. There is in the British Museum a painted vase³ of the red figure style, on which are seen two satyrs playing at a game like our 'see-saw,' with this difference—important for a group in the round—that each is within arm's reach of the other. The one, in fact, holds the other firmly by the wrists, with the intention of pulling him over, and thus upsetting the balance of the plank, near the centre of which they are both placed, the one opposite to the other. They do not stand on the plank, but have sunk, each on his knees, with the heels

raised, so that the only hold they have on it is where their knees rest. The plank is placed horizontally on a pivot raised a little from the ground. Such a group would suit admirably for sculpture in the round. The plank being short and placed at no distance up from the ground, would range with the top of the pedestal and present no incongruity. The keen excitement of the contest would bring out a display of action and expression such as would have commended itself to Myron, with his love of closely observing nature in her commoner forms.

While then it is clear that the Greeks had not only a game answering to our 'see-saw' but also a variety of it very suitable for a group of sculpture, it remains to be proved that the word *pristae* was applied to it as well as to actual sawyers. If that could be done, the difficulty in this case would be much reduced, if not altogether removed. Aristophanes, *Achar.* 36, plays on the words *πρίω* and *πρίων*. The speaker says that his demos did not know the word 'buy'; his demos produced everything itself; there was no *πρίων*, no 'see-sawing,' as I suppose. Upon this the scholiast remarks, *τοῦτο παιδιὰ καλεῖται ἀπὸ γὰρ τοῦ πρίω ῥήματος ὄνομα τοῦ πρίων*. If he merely means 'This is what is called a pun,' then, being not much the wiser for that, we must look elsewhere for a definition of *πρίων*. Hesychius gives it as an equivalent of *ἀγοράζων*, while the scholiast to *Achar.* 625 has *ἀγοράζων* as *ἐν ἀγορᾷ διατρίβειν*. If *ἀγοράζων* contained the sense of being pulled at by rival traders in the market, the word *πρίων* may readily have come to be used with the same signification, since the working of a saw by two persons presented so obvious an analogy. To this I am inclined to add the proverb *ἀγορὰ Κερκόπων*, because on one of the archaic metopes from Selinus we see Herakles carrying over his shoulder the two Kerkopes bound by the knees to a plank, and presenting just the appearance of the two satyrs on our vase, turned upside down. I would have liked to take the *παιδιά* of the scholiast in its ordinary sense of a game and suppose him to say: 'from the verb *πρίω* is the name of *πρίων*, the game.'⁴ If that

¹ *Nat. Hist.* xxxiv. 57.

² E. Petersen, *Arch. Zeit.* 1865, p. 91.

³ Vase Cat. No. 996; engraved in *Bullet. de l'Acad. de Bruxelles*, xii. pt. i. p. 289. For an example of 'see-saw,' practised in the modern manner, see a Greek vase in Gerhard's *Ant. Bildwerke*, pl. 53, or Panofka's *Bilder antiken Lebens*, pl. 18, fig. 3.

⁴ In another passage, *Wasps.* 694, Aristophanes seems to refer to an actual group of sawyers.

is right, the persons playing at this game would naturally be called *pristae*, and we should be free to take Pliny's word as applicable to Myron either in the sense of actual sawyers, or of a group of two figures playing at a game, as on our vase. These figures may have been satyrs, as on the vase, or boys in ordinary life. A known group by Myron consisted of Athene and a satyr. But boys or satyrs would have made an equally admirable subject for him.

I may note that Suidas gives *πισθείς* as equivalent to *δεσμευθείς*, citing Soph. *Ajax*, 1019 (Lobeck), while Hesychius gives *πρίορας* = *χερῶν τοὺς δεσμούς*, from which it appears that the signification of 'being bound' or

'fettered' had been superadded to the signification of 'sawing.' It is conceivable that the use of *πρίων* for a game as practised on our vase may have helped to bring about this new meaning. But these are questions on which I venture with all diffidence.

It has been suggested that the game in question may have been called *πεταυρισμός*, a plank being *πέταυρα*, *πέτευρον* or *πέντευρον*. But the metaphor of a *πεταυρισμός τῆς τύχης* would seem to suit better the ordinary game of 'see-saw' as practised on a vase already referred to (in note 3), than the vase of which I have been speaking more particularly.

A. S. MURRAY.

ON SOME POLITICAL TERMS EMPLOYED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

THE title of this paper is vague, and needs definition. By 'political terms' I do not mean titles of magistrates and other officials mentioned in the New Testament; although to the student of Greek antiquities these afford an interesting field of inquiry, in which a good deal remains to be done.¹ My object will rather resemble that of the late Dr. Field in part iii. of his *Oltum Norvicense*, a book which its learned author issued privately, but which deserves to be more widely published; for no student of Scripture can read it without profit and delight. I have often wished to do with Greek inscriptions, what Dr. Field has done with later Greek literature, viz. employ their diction and phraseology to illustrate New Testament idioms. It is certain that they would repay the search. Thus in addition to the instances of the phrase *ἀποδοχῆς ἄξιος* cited by Field on 1 Tim. i. 15, we may quote the following from an Ephesian inscription now at Oxford: *Τίτου Αἰλίου | Πρίσκου, ἀνδρὸς δοκιμωτάτου, καὶ | πάσης τιμῆς καὶ ἀποδοχῆς ἄξιον* (Baillie, *Fasc. Inscr. Gr.* No. 2; see Waddington, *Fastes*, p. 225). Other examples of the same phrase may be found in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Atticarum*, ii. 628, *fin.* (1st century B.C.); Keil, *Sylloge Inscriptionum Baot.* xxxi. 14; *Corpus Inscr. Gr.* 2349 b, compare 3524, line 29; also in the well-known decree in honour of Menas at Sestos, about B.C. 120 (Dittenberger, *Sylloge*, No. 246, lines 13—14):

τῆς καλλίστης ἀποδοχῆς ἀξιούμενος παρ' αὐτῷ. It may also be worth observing that the word *προσκατέρησις*, which is a *ᾄπαξ λεγόμενον* in Ephes. vi. 18 (although, of course, the verb *προσκατερεῖν* is frequent enough in the New Testament,) is employed, exactly as St. Paul used it, in a Jewish deed of enfranchisement from Kertch, dated the 377th year of the Pontic era, i.e. 81 A.D. It is published by Gille, *Antiquités du Bosphore Cimmerien*, vol. ii. Inscriptions, No. xxii. (compare *C.I.G.* 2114 bb), and is worth quoting for more reasons than one. It runs thus:—

Βασιλείοντος βασιλέως Τιβε-
ρίου Ἰουλίου Ῥησκουπόριδος φιλο-
καίσαρος καὶ φιλορωμαίου ἐῖσε-
σεβοῦς, ἔτους Ζοτ, μηνὸς Περει[τί]-
ου ιβ, Χρήστη γυνὴ πρότε[ρο]- 5
ν Π (Ι) Δ(ρ)ούσου ἀφείημι ἐπὶ τῆς πρ[ο]-
σευχῆς θρεπτόν μου Ἰρακλᾶ[ι]
ἐλεύθερον καθάπαξ κατὰ εὐχ[ή]-
μον, [ἀ]νεπίληπτο[ν] καὶ ἀπα[ρ]ετό-
χλητον ἀπὸ παιτὸς κληρονόμ[ου], 10
[τ]ρέπεσται (sic) αὐτὸν ὅπου ἂν βού-
λ[η]ται ἀνεπικωλύτως καθὼς ε[ἴ]-
ξάμην χωρὶς ἱ[ς] τὴν προσεν-
[χ]ῇ ἢ θωπείας τε καὶ προσκα[ρτ]-
[ρ]ήσεως,² συνεπιανεσάτων δὲ 15
καὶ τῶν κληρ[ο]νόμων μου Ἰ[φι]-
κλείδου καὶ Ἐλίκω[ι]δ[ος].
συνε[πι]ροπ[ε]νούσ[η]ς δὲ καὶ τῇ[ς]
συναγωγῆς τῶν Ἰουδαίων.

¹ It is only quite lately that we have been able to define the precise functions and status of the 'town-clerk' at Ephesus (*γραμματεὺς τοῦ δήμου*, see Menadier, *Qua conditione Ephesii usi sint*, etc. Berlin, 1880, p. 78), of the *ἀσπίρχαι*, see Marquardt, *Römische Alterthümer*, iv. p. 374, and of the *οἰκονόμος τῆς πόλεως* at Corinth (Rom. xvi. 23; see Menadier, *ibid.* p. 77).

² The manumitted slave is pledged only to one obligation, that of diligent attendance at the synagogue worship. It was not uncommon in Greek deeds of manumission to make certain conditions (see Foucart, *Sur l'Affranchissement des Esclaves*). Similarly in *C.I.G.* 2114 b, we read in the same connection: *θωπείας [καὶ προσκαρτ]ερήσεως*.

In the abundance of the materials at our command, it becomes necessary to limit in some way the scope of our inquiry. It is proposed therefore, in this paper, to adduce epigraphical illustration only of those words and phrases which the sacred writers have adopted from Greek political life. Even when thus restricted, our subject is wide enough; for the range of political interests in Greece was almost co-extensive with the life of the people. A free Greek was nothing if not a *πολίτης*, and it is remarkable how copious was the vocabulary of Greek politics,—how many ordinary words were (so to speak) minted afresh to be employed in the currency of public life.

πόλις.

I begin with *πόλις*, noting that what Athens was as a *πόλις*, such in its degree was every free Hellenic city. The whole of Greece proper, and the islands and shores of the Mediterranean, teemed with separate civic centres, each with its *χώρα* or territory, many being the ‘mother-cities’ of colonies, many having subject-cities under tribute, and each governed by its own citizens, the privileged possessors of its civic franchise. Now to the Jew of Palestine and of the Dispersion Jerusalem was all that his *πόλις* was to a Greek, and much more. Nor would it be difficult to trace in detail a striking analogy between a Greek *πόλις* and the position of Jerusalem as the centre of national and religious interests. The nationality of the Jew was marked by his right to partake in certain *sacra*, and this right depended upon blood-relationship, and these *sacra* had their centre in Zion. In all this the resemblance to a Greek *πόλις* and its *πολιται* is obvious at a glance. But I doubt whether it has received the attention it deserves. Even Bishop Lightfoot considers that the Apostolic conception of the Heavenly City with its spiritual franchise was connected, not with the municipal life of Greece, but rather with the cosmopolitan ideas of Stoicism then in the air. He speaks of ‘the age of the Seleucids and Ptolemies’ as a time ‘when the old national barriers had been overthrown, and petty states with all their interests and ambitions had crumbled into the dust.’ But however far we may allow this to be true, the fact remains that under Alexander and his successors (we are not here concerned with the Roman Empire), the life of the people was essentially municipal still. And the origin of the New Testament idea of the Heavenly City should be traced (it appears to me), directly to the Hebrew

associations of Jerusalem, as clothed in the language and blended with the sentiments of old Greek citizenship. I should point in proof of this to the Epistle to the Hebrews and to the Apocalypse, in both of which the figure of a Heavenly Canaan is replaced by the figure of a heavenly *πόλις* with a heavenly franchise, and this as a development from purely Hebrew ideas. It was different with St. Augustine. He may well have owed something to Stoicism: but his *Civitas Dei* was of course suggested by the Empire and Franchise of Rome, though not without perpetual reference to the heavenly citizenship as set forth in the New Testament.

In Ephesians ii. 12 foll. Jewish and Greek ideas are curiously blended in describing the previous exclusion and present admission of the Gentile to the franchise of the Church: ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι τῆς πολιτείας τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ξένοι—thus far all is entirely Greek. The next idea is quite Jewish—(ξένοι) τῶν διαθηκῶν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, κ.τ.λ. In the two next verses the μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ appears to allude to the balustrade which barred the Gentiles from entering the Inner Temple.¹ Then again follow Greek civic terms: ἄρα οὖν οὐκέτι ἐστὲ ξένοι καὶ πάροικοι, ἀλλὰ ἐστε συμπολίται τῶν ἁγίων—and these again are merged in Hebrew ideas of the Church as the family and the temple of God. Elsewhere in the New Testament these ideas are reversed: the citizen of Zion is a stranger in the world.

1 Pet. ii. 11: ὡς παροίκους καὶ παρεπιδήμους . . . τὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἔχοντες καλῇν.

So *ibid.* i. 17: ἐν φόβῳ τὸν τῆς παροικίας ὑμῶν χρόνον ἀναστράφητε.

And i. 1: παρεπιδήμους.

Heb. xi. 13: ὅτι ξένοι καὶ παρεπίδημοί εἰσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς . . . ἠτοίμασε γὰρ αὐτοῖς πόλιν.

(Cp. *ibid.* 9: παρώκησεν εἰς γῆν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ὡς ἀλλοτρίαν.)

πάροικος, ξένος, κ.τ.λ.

Here let me note that *πάροικοι*, *παρεπίδημοι*, *ξένοι*, and *ἀναστροφή* are each of them terms which recall facts of Greek public life. We are familiar with the *μέτοικοι*, or *ξένοι μέτοικοι*,

¹ The δρύφρακτος λίθινος of Josephus, *B.J.* v. 5, § 2. διὰ τούτου προΐόντων ἐπὶ τὸ δεύτερον ἱερὸν δρύφρακτος περιβέβλητο λίθινος, τρίπηχυς μὲν ὕψος, πάνυ δὲ χαρίεντως διεργασμένος. ἐν αὐτῷ δ' εἰστήκεσαν ἐξ Ἰσού διαστήματος στήλαι τὸν τῆς ἀγνείας προσημαίνουσαι νόμον, αἱ μὲν Ἑλληνικοῖς αἱ δὲ Ῥωμαϊκοῖς γράμμασι, μὴ δεῖν ἀλλόφυλον ἐντὸς τοῦ ἁγίου παρίεναι· τὸ γὰρ δεύτερον ἱερὸν ἅγιον ἐκαλεῖτο. One of these inscriptions has been discovered, and was published by M. Ch. Clermont-Ganneau ('Une Stèle du Temple de Jerusalem'), *Revue Arch.* 1872, p. 214.

at Athens, the 'licensed sojourners' whose protection and status was secured by the payment of a small tax, as contrasted with the ξένοι, or ξένοι παρεπιδημοῦντες, who were strangers, merely sojourning in a town too short a time to care to secure the rights of μετοικία. The same meaning attached to the term μέτοικος at Iulis in Ceos (Dittenberger, *Sylloge*, No. 348), Tegea (*C.I.G.* 1513b), and apparently at Argos (*C.I.G.* Nos. 14, 19). But the same status was more often designated by πάροικος, as at Carpathos (Dittenberger, 331); Carthaea in Ceos (*C.I.G.* 2357); at Thespieae and Aeraephia (*C.I.G.* 1631, 1625); at Ilium Novum (*C.I.G.* 3595 = the Sigeon Inscription at Cambridge); at Teos (*C.I.G.* 3049); at Priene (*C.I.G.* 2906), and at Ephesus (Le Bas, *Voyage Arch.* iii. 136a = the Oxford decree about Mithridates). Concerning the other cities we have as yet no evidence; but it is observable that the term πάροικος seems to grow more frequent the further we go eastward. This all lends new meaning to the terms πάροικος, -αῖν, -ία, as used in the LXX. and New Testament; they were words borrowed by the Jews from the language of Greek politics. For the term ξένοι, or ξένοι παρεπιδημοῦντες, or ἐπιδημοῦντες ξένοι, Acts xvii. 21, and ἐπιδ. Ῥωμαῖοι, Acts ii. 10 (temporary sojourners who have not yet secured the rights of πάροικοι or μέτοικοι), it is enough to refer to *C.I.G.* 3521 (Pergamon), 1338 (Amyclae), 2347k (Syros), 2286, 2288 (Delos), *Hermes* vii. 133 (Sestos). I forbear to enlarge upon the later usage of the word ἐκκλησία ἢ παροικοῦσα ἐν—.

Ἀναστροφή.

But St. Peter combines πάροικοι and παρεπιδημοί with the word ἀναστροφή, and of this combination the inscriptions afford curious illustration: *C.I.G.* 1193 (Hermione), [ἐπαυρέσαι] τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους ἐπὶ τε τῇ ἐνδομίᾳ καὶ τῇ ἀναστροφῇ [ἃ π]εποιήνται ἀξίως ἐκατέρων τῶν πολιῶν (Hermione and Asine); *C.I.G.* 1331 (Sparta), ἐπαυρέσαι δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ ἐνδομῇ καὶ ἀναστροφῇ, ἃ πεποιήνται ἐν τῇ πόλει: *C.I.G.* 1339 (Messenia), ἐπαυρέσαι . . . [ἐπὶ τῇ ἐνδομῇ καὶ ἀναστροφῇ ἃ πεποιήνται, κ.τ.λ.: Keil, *Syll. Inscr. Boeot.* No. IVb. οἵτινες παραγερόμενοι τὰν τ[ε] παρεπιδημίων καὶ ἀναστροφῶν ἐποιήσαντο ἀξίως ἐκατ[ε]ραν τῶν πολιῶν: *C.I.G.* 3053 (Unossos), ἀποσταλθέντες παρ Τηρίων προτὶ τὰς ἐν Κρήτῃ πόλεις, καὶ διατρίψαντες τὸν πλεῖστον χρόνον ἐν τῇ αἰμῇ πόλει οὐ μόνον τὰν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀναστροφῆς εὐταξίαν [ἀπ]εδείξαντο . . . καλῶς καὶ εὐτάκτως ἐνδεδα[μῆ]κασιν], κ.τ.λ. Instances like these

from honorary decrees voted to foreign dikasts, or ambassadors, might be accumulated without limit (see Keil, *Schedae Epigr.* p. 26). In St. Peter the construction is ἔχοντες τὴν ἀναστροφήν, but in all the instances I have observed in inscribed decrees the verb is ποιῆσθαι. I add one more example from a Prienean inscription, because it illustrates another New Testament word ἀνέγκλητος, which is a common one in Greek decrees: τοῖς μὲν παραγερομένοις ἄνδρας—ἐπήνεσεν ἐπὶ τε τῷ σωφρόνως καὶ ἀνεγκλήτως παρεπιδημῆσαι, κ.τ.λ.

προστάτις.

When St. Paul says of Phoebe that she had been his προστάτις at Corinth (Rom. xvi. 2: καὶ γὰρ αὐτὴ προστάτις πολλῶν ἐγένεθη καὶ ἐμοῦ αὐτοῦ), we are again reminded of Greek political life; the προστάτης at Athens was the political sponsor of the μέτοικος. In some Greek cities a definite board of προστάται appear to have existed, charged with similar functions towards aliens; it was so at Rhodes, at Cnidus, at Calymna, at Iasos, at Iulis in Ceos, and at Amphipolis.¹ In Graeco-Roman times προστάτης was the recognised equivalent of patronus, unless the Latin word was simply Graecised as πάτρων, or less commonly πάτρωνος: occasionally we even find πατρώνισσα. Schürer (*Die Gemeindeverfassung der Juden*, p. 31) reminds us that the Roman Collegia had their Patroni, and suggests that St. Paul's use of the word προστάτις ('in a very general and indefinite sense') was suggested by the Patroni of Collegia. I do not, however, find προστάτης ever used in Greek in this sense of patronus. And I prefer to think that St. Paul's use of the word was derived immediately from its common political sense. The Christians at the port of Corinth were in the position of resident aliens in the presence of Graeco-Roman society, and even in respect of the Jews established there; and Phoebe may well have been a woman of some social position and of wealth, who employed her influence (after her baptism) to protect and befriend the Church of which she was a διάκονος.

πολίτευμα.

It has been often remarked that whereas at Philippi, a Roman colonia, the citizens were proudly conscious of their political status (Acts xvi. 21), St. Paul in his letter to the Philippian Church employs twice over a strong political metaphor; i. 27: ἀξίως

¹ See Part iii. of *Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum*, No. 420.

τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ Χριστοῦ πολιτεύεσθε, and iii. 20: ἡμῶν γὰρ τὸ πολίτευμα ἐν οὐρανοῖς ὑπάρχει. I have not, however, seen it noticed in this connexion that the word πολίτευμα is used in the famous Jewish decree from the Cyrenaica (*C.I.G.* 5361) for the Jewish community at Berenice. This decree is dated B.C. 13, so that the word πολίτευμα had been adopted from Greek civic life into Jewish usage, before the Apostle employed it for the heavenly citizenship of the Church. Another inscription found at Pompeii, but certainly of Egyptian origin, and dated B.C. 3, exhibits the same word πολίτευμα employed of an association of Phrygians, whom we must suppose to have resided in some Egyptian town or district in the enjoyment of their own laws, religion, and administration of justice. Their priest dedicates a statue to Phrygian Zeus. The inscription reads as follows (*C.I.G.* 5866c):

Γάϊος Ἰούλιος Ἡφαιστίωνος
υἱὸς Ἡφαιστίων ἱερατεύσας
τοῦ πολιτεύματος τῶν Φρυ-
γῶν ἀνέθηκε Δία Φρύγιον, κ.τ.λ.

Κτίσις.

Κτίσις, so commonly used in the New Testament for the Creation, and Κτιστής ('Creator,' 1 Pet. iv. 19) are terms which had previously belonged to political history. Κτιστής was the term for the Founder of a city (as οἰκιστής was of a colony), and the title was frequently given in later days to kings and emperors, and even to private persons, who had been great benefactors to a city. Κτίσις was the term for the founding of a city (Polyb. ix. 1, § 4); compare Κτίσις, a geographical poem by Apollonius Rhodius, a title which Mommsen thinks may have suggested to Cato the idea of his *Origines* (Book iii. ch. 14, vol. ii. p. 477, English Translation).

Βασιλεύς.

Before going further let us remind ourselves of the obvious fact, that Hellenism was made familiar to the Jews of Palestine and the Dispersion by means of the Syrian and Egyptian monarchies. In tracing back therefore the Greek political words of the LXX. and New Testament, we need not always go back at once to Attic law and Athenian literature: it is even more necessary to fix our attention upon the political antiquities of Asia Minor and the shores of the Levant. In this connexion observe that one element of this Hellenism had been, from the first, powerful and enlightened monarchies. Alexander inscribed himself

as βασιλεύς on the Prienian temple, and the title was assumed by Antigonos, Lysimachus, Seleucus and Ptolemy in 306 B.C. It was under the Alexandrian monarchy that the version of the LXX. had its origin, and it was the policy of the Syrian kings which shaped the history and character of later Judaism. The term βασιλεύς therefore was instinct with present meaning and full of absorbing associations when the Jews first learned it as the translation of their vernacular title. The LXX. may almost be said to revel in the terms βασιλεύς, βασιλεία, βασιλεύω, &c.

Μετοικίζω, μετοικεσία.

Before I pass on from the mention of royalty, let me note that the idea and practice of transporting whole populations to please a monarch's whim were quite familiar to the subjects of the Diadochi, though they seem to veil the fact under the terms συνοικίζεσθαι, παροικίζεσθαι (see the Teos inscription, my *Manual*, 149, § 9, § 14). I have already observed that a resident alien was in most places out of Attica called a πάροικος: accordingly the word μετοικίζω was ready to be appropriated for the sense of 'change of abode.' In this sense μετοικίζεσθαι is used in the same inscription § 9; and the verb, with its cognates μετοικία and μετοικεσία, were ready at hand in ordinary Greek when the LXX. had to describe the events of the Captivity.

Φρουρά, φρουρεῖν.

Another element of the history of those days was the garrisoning of the Greek cities by the kings. Thus the history of Athens after Alexander until the advent of the Romans was a long struggle to be rid of Macedonian garrisons. The same thing was true of the cities of Asia Minor in the days of Lysimachus, the Seleucidae and the Ptolemies. Let me *e.g.* call attention to a curious decree from Priene published by me in the *Hellenic Journal*, 1883. Now the word for garrison is uniformly φρουρά, φρουρεῖν, the soldiers are φρουροί. The verb occurs in its literal sense in 2 Cor. xi. 32: ἐν Δαμασκῷ ὁ ἐθνάρχης Ἀρέτα τοῦ βασιλέως ἐφρούρει τὴν Δαμασκηῶν πόλιν πιάσαι με (when the R.V. seems less accurate than the A.V. Marquardt, *Röm. Alterth.* iv. p. 247 takes the word in its strict sense). I do not wish to dogmatise nor to impose this one meaning upon φρουρεῖν *semper et ubique*; but a glance at the literature and documents of the Hellenistic period will show that the word in this sense was in perpetual use, and

can hardly have been employed in the New Testament without a reminiscence of it. *φρουρά* = garrison, 2 Sam. viii. 6, 14; 1 Paral. xviii. 13; 1 Macc. ix. 51, xi. 66, xii. 34, xiv. 33; *φρουρεῖν* = to garrison, Judith iii. 6; 1 Esdras iv. 56; similarly *φρουρίον* and *φρουρός* in LXX. Indeed I think the meaning of garrison is universal in the Old Testament. The passages in the Epistles are these:—

Gal. iii. 23: ὑπὸ νόμον ἐφρουρούμεθα συν-κλειόμενοι εἰς τὴν μέλλουσαν πίστιν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι.

1 Pet. i. 5: ἐν δυνάμει Θεοῦ φρουρούμενους διὰ πίστεως εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐπαγγελίαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι.

Phil. iv. 7: καὶ ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ ὑπερέχουσα πάντα νοῦν φρουρήσει τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν καὶ τὰ νοήματα.

Are we in these passages to maintain the figure of a garrison keeping ward over a town, or are we to adopt the idea of soldiers keeping guard either to prevent escape, or to protect the weak? It is significant that Schleusner refers only to Symmachus' version of Ps. lxxxviii 9 and Wisdom xvii. 15 for this sense of 'custoditus, clausus quasi in carcere': he compares Gal. iii. 23, but I confess that even here I prefer the notion of a garrisoned town. In the other two passages there seems little doubt that this is the better meaning.

E. L. HICKS.

(To be continued.)

THE GREEK AND LATIN CLASSICS AND ENGLISH LITERATURE.

Those who are interested in the establishment at Oxford of a school of English literature may be grateful to the indefatigable Mr. Collins for having at any rate promoted the discussion, and so hastened on the practical stage of the subject. The man who simultaneously and persistently works two such divergent oracles as the respectable *Quarterly* and the vociferous *Pall Mall*, at any rate gets the matter talked about. And a good deal more talk will probably be required at Oxford before the time will have arrived for legislation. Meanwhile it may not be superfluous to point out that Mr. Collins's cloud of witnesses do not give quite such a clear unanimous lead as has sometimes been assumed, and that his own proposal is open to grave objection.

If the interesting person known as the 'general reader' were asked about the recent controversy, he would probably regard it as established that the Universities were shamefully behindhand in the recognition of English Literature, and that all competent opinion united in demanding the new study, and in insisting that it should not be divorced from Classics. Not much less than this is claimed by the *Pall Mall Gazette*: 'Everybody was agreed on the necessity of removing the national disgrace of an English university in which English is not studied' . . . 'should it be associated with the Greek and Latin classics, or rather (as is the case at Cambridge) with the other literatures of modern Europe? on this question also there will be

found a remarkable agreement.'¹ Mr. Collins goes even further: 'What is expected from [the Hebdomadal Council] has during the last three months been proclaimed definitely and imperiously by the voice of the whole nation.'² And then he arrays his authorities, first on the question of establishing the new study, secondly on the question of the divorce from Classics.

An examination of the documents is far from confirming these large conclusions. The *Pall Mall Extra* which is substantially the compilation of Mr. Collins, contains forty-five letters from eminent (or rather eminent) men, of which the words, or in a few cases the substance, is given. Of these forty-five, the opinions on the first question may be classified as follows:—

Favourable to a new Honour examination	13
Unfavourable to a new Honour examination	13
Not prepared to express an opinion	8
Vague approval of the study	9
No opinion	2

45

Judgments might differ as to the classification of a few of these witnesses: but one may feel confident that none would differ very widely from the distribution of votes given above. On the second question, though there is more agreement, there is also a good deal of vague language, and a large number express no opinion at all. The difficulty of

¹ *Pall Mall Extra on English Literature*, p. 2.

² *Quarterly Review*, No. 327, p. 245.

classifying is greater than before, but we may perhaps arrange the writers as follows :—

Favourable to combination with classics.	21
Unfavourable	4
No opinion expressed.	19
Unclassed	1
	45

But even the comparative support given by the twenty-one who, by a liberal interpretation, are classed as favourable, is easily seen on a closer examination to be of very little value. Some of them are unfavourable to an Honour examination: some mean by associating English with Classics the insertion of a few English books in a classical examination: some intend English to be a subsequent study when the classical studies are ended: and a still larger number give no hint of what they mean. A consensus, so limited, of opinions so incoherent and indefinite, does not even begin to be a support to the very precise views of Mr. Collins, who wishes to run the three languages, in teaching and examination, absolutely parallel to the last.

It is of course possible that when the time comes for action, it may be found that many of these eminent persons are in favour of Mr. Collins's scheme. It is, however, equally possible that they may be found to be the opposite. But the real conclusion which the student of these documents arrives at, is the unsatisfactoriness of this method of agitation. A circular of inquiries, issued by an enterprising journal, and accompanied or preceded by broad hints of the answers desired, leads to many undesirable results. Some eminent men refuse to answer, and imbibe a distaste for the whole question. Some give oracular and non-committal replies: an unworthy occupation for the writer, and a needless irritation to the reader. Some express hasty and ill-considered opinions, which commit the writers prematurely, and likewise give scope to misrepresentation. And the enthusiast, who has evoked these reluctant and often extemporised views, is perhaps insensibly led into imagining a unanimity which ultimately proves fallacious. The one advantage is, as we have said above, that discussion is promoted. But it may well be doubted if from such unripe discussion there is much substantial gain.

In Mr. Collins's own scheme, there is much that is at first sight attractive; and particularly in the glowing passage (which we unfortunately have not space to quote)—where he describes the literature student mastering successively Oratory, the Drama,

Epic, Lyric, and Didactic poetry, beginning with the classical examples and pursuing the study through the best English works—he no doubt describes a course of reading which could not fail, if properly handled, to be interesting and instructive. But the objections to the scheme, both theoretic and practical, he seems very imperfectly to appreciate.

It is perhaps convenient to begin with a short sketch of what his proposal is.

The three languages, Greek, Latin, English, are to be studied strictly together. The school is to be an Honour Final School, apart from the existing examinations. The subject is to be divided into three, Poetry, Rhetoric and Criticism. First, Poetry. In the classical part the student will be asked to translate 'with elucidatory comments' pieces from the leading poets, from Homer to Theocritus, and from Lucretius to Prudentius. The leading English poets of all periods must be read, and 'prescribed masterpieces critically studied.' Rhetoric is to include 'Historical composition regarded as Rhetoric:' but the books he leaves to the Board of Studies to prescribe. In Criticism, the student is to work at the 'history of the literatures' and likewise master the leading ancient treatises on literature, to which is to be added Lessing's *Laocoon*.

In this scheme we think the general voice of practical educationists will find several grave defects. In the classical part there is at once immensely too much, and considerably too little. There is for example in Latin poetry alone, besides Plautus and Terence, the 1400 pages of the *Corpus Poetarum*, with Prudentius superadded. In Greek, besides Homer, Hesiod, the *Poetae Scenici*, the Idyllists and the Lyricists—a list which no one would wish to diminish if there were time for it—we must also add Apollonius Rhodius,¹ and some at least of the Alexandrine didactics. The Greek list would include some, and the Latin much, which is not first-rate literature: and all the while Livy, Tacitus, Thucydides and Herodotus are only treated as Rhetoric; and Pliny, Cicero's letters and treatises, and the whole of Plato,² are omitted. Imagine a scheme of literature

¹ Later than the prescribed period, but specially included by Mr. Collins.

² Mr. Collins seems to feel this objection at one point, for he proposes to admit no one to the English school who has not obtained a third in Greats (*Quarterly*, p. 259). But this quite impossible and suicidal proposal—for the result would be prohibitory to the new studies—is inconsistent with his other suggestion that Literature should stand to Greats in the same relation as the old Law and History School (p. 258), where no such restriction was dreamt of.

which includes seventeen books of *Punica* and the *Hymnus Teiunantium*, and which ignores the *Gorgias*, the *Republic*, and the *Symposium*!

In English the case is still stronger. There the division into Poetry and Rhetoric—even with the strained interpretation of Rhetoric which includes History—is even more fatal to a real representation of the Literature. A scheme of English literature which excludes Wycliffe, Malory, More, Aseham, Sidney, Hooker, Bacon, Burton, Milton's prose works, Hobbes, Locke, much of Taylor, Barrow, South; Bunyan, Cowley's prose, Walton, Evelyn, Pepys, Steele, Addison, Berkeley, Defoe, Swift, Johnson, Goldsmith, Fielding, Smollett, Sterne,—with certain small exceptions that might find a place under Rhetoric or Criticism—such a scheme, is, to use an expression Mr. Collins himself has adopted, 'a fraud upon letters.' It may be noted as a final touch of the irony of fate, that under Mr. Collins's system it will be still open to a graduate in the school of literature, to be ignorant whether *Arcadia* and *Oceana* are poetry or prose.

Quite as grave again are the practical objections to the classical examination. The classical books are just the Moderations studies over again, with the addition of the silver age. All the arguments that the 'modernisers' urge against continuing on at college the same round of classical studies that so many had wearied of at school, lie with much greater force against a final school where the examination consists in Latin and Greek translations with elucidatory comments. The student has been all his life translating with elucidatory comments. He wants to plunge, we will suppose, into his favourite study, Modern Literature: and with what eyes will he regard the necessity of giving so many hours a week to keep up the Homer, Aeschylus, Tacitus, and Juvenal of Mods, not to speak of the Silius Italicus and Prudentius whose acquaintance he now makes for the first time! And there is a still more serious objection in the character which the classical part of such an examination would certainly assume. There would not be time for both classical part and English part to be thoroughly done, and the weight would be thrown into that side of the study which was new. The classical translations would be regarded as the lower thing, which had to be done up to a certain standard: but to which it was waste of time to devote much pains. In short the classical part would inevitably become the *Pass* part: the English, the *Honour* part of the examination. The

classics would be relegated to the position of Divinity in Honour Moderations: with the same fatal results to the study. The object would be to scrape through; men would read the minimum: and examiners would be reluctant to plough. The real force of teachers and taught would be thrown into the English. The fact is that it is quite possible to agree with Mr. Collins's reiterated dogma, that English should be taught 'in connection with classics,' and yet to object wholly to the special meaning which he attaches to it, that the students of English shall be forced for their Final Examination to read up large masses of Greek and Latin authors. What the student really wants is to be familiar in a general way with the Origins of Literature among the Greeks and Romans, as part (and though it be the largest, yet not the only part) of the literary influences that have acted on English authors. It is quite as indispensable that he should have a general idea—and the more the knowledge is first-hand the better, in this case also—of the foreign modern literary influences, to which our great writers owe so much. The French, the Italian, the German, even the Scandinavian and the Spanish influences, are all, in various degrees and at various epochs, of first-rate importance for the thorough study of English. A study which should treat English literature as a simple product of classics, besides being to the last degree misleading, would tend to repeat the old blunder from which we are only just escaping, of educational narrowness. To realise in practice what is true in the idea of teaching English 'in connection with classics,' it would be quite sufficient that the students of the new subject should have passed through, at school and college, the ordinary classical course. They would even then start far better equipped for appreciating the classical influence, than for understanding any of the others. And simple practical considerations point the same way. The obvious plan would be to open the new Literature School to those who had passed Classical Moderations. The school would then stand on the same footing as Modern History, Law, Theology, and *Literae Humaniores*: the only difference being that the early training in this case would be more specially appropriate to the final study. And as Canon Percival says in his reasonable and weighty letter, it cannot be seriously maintained that by such an arrangement 'any detriment would accrue to scholarship or learning or to the reputation of the university as a home of the higher education.'

Two questions remain, where possibly more difference of opinion is to be expected: as to whether the other modern Literatures are to be included in the school, and whether language is to be studied as well as literature. The first one may be dismissed very briefly. No proposal has been made, and it may be assumed that no proposal will be made, to put in the other Modern Languages except as *alternatives* to English. The *Pall Mall* professes to be afraid of English being 'associated' with modern languages. We fail to see why the most bigoted opponent of a school of modern European languages and literature need object to such 'association' as is implied in the system of alternatives. If Mr. Collins thinks the study of French would act prejudicially on the study of English, a view which strikes us as groundless, at any rate we fail to see how a student of English is damnified by the fact that another man in the same university is reading French, and will be examined at the same time, and appear in the same Class List.

The other question, whether language shall be added to literature in the new school, will no doubt be much more hotly discussed. It is idle to attempt to shake a hardened and impenitent Antiphilologer like Mr. Collins, with his great gifts, his wide knowledge of literature, and his strongly formed and loudly expressed opinions. But a few considerations may be offered which may have weight with the more ordinary and practical men, who after all will have to decide the question of the new studies, and prescribe the conditions and the course. It is indeed one of the unfortunate results of Mr. Collins's forcible style of controversy, that he feels himself bound successively to repudiate and rebuke the Oxford and Cambridge teachers of English,¹ the University legislators,² and popular opinion,³ which at least will go for something in the settlement.

It may, for example, be plausibly urged that if English Literature has been neglected, so still more has the English language: that for a hundred men who leave the University with some knowledge of the literature, not one can be found who knows as much of the growth of his own language as he does of the Classical tongues: that the University is

least of all the place where English should be studied without some sound knowledge of its origin: that in no scheme of Literature can Chaucer be omitted, and that to read Chaucer with no knowledge of middle English is hardly less absurd than to read Homer with only a knowledge of Attic: that if a knowledge of Anglo-Saxon and the elements of Gothic, sufficient to give some first-hand knowledge of the beginnings of English Literature, can be acquired with a few months' study, as competent authorities assure us, it would be a great pity to sacrifice the chance of making the survey of the ground relatively complete, for the sake of keeping in the course a mass of classics of which the old is a repetition of Moderation-studies, and much of the new is comparatively irrelevant. And there is another danger which the addition of the language would avoid. A course of teaching which is literary merely, though stimulating in diverse degrees, and likely to evoke the highest faculties of a few, may with many minds have too indefinite a character, and with not a few tend to sink into the communication of opinions and criticisms learned at second-hand. The element of definiteness in linguistic study: the training in accuracy, capable of being brought to a test: the sense of mastery acquired in learning an unfamiliar tongue: the tracing relations between the earlier and later forms of the language: these things would be present to correct the dangerous tendency referred to, and to make the combined study more of a mental training. And all this is apart from the light which the study of language must necessarily throw upon literature, and on which much more might be said.

Much of this, no doubt, those who agree with Mr. Collins would admit: some of it he has himself admitted in his article. His difficulty is the shortness of the time; which no doubt, under his classical scheme, particularly as he only allows a year for the systematic study of English,⁴ would be fatal to any possibility of including language. But under the more reasonable scheme here advocated, where the classics are not systematically read beyond Moderations, and two years and a term are thus saved for English, the difficulty disappears.

A. SIDGWICK.

¹ October *Quarterly*. ² January *Quarterly*, p. 242.

³ January *Quarterly*, p. 243.

Quarterly, p. 259.

REVIEWS.

Homer : an Introduction to the Iliad and the Odyssey. By R. C. JEBB, Litt.D., &c. Glasgow : Maclehose, 1887.

It is a strange thing that we should have had to wait till this year for a handy introduction to Homer, but it is stranger to think that even in Germany there has not appeared, so far as I am aware, any work possessing claims to do what Professor Jebb has done. The want, now that it has been met, seems so obvious, and yet so well within the limits of a reasonable treatment, that it is hard to see why the beginner should have been left to glean his general *conspectus* of the subject from histories of Greece, histories of Greek literature, histories of art, and the introductions or notes of commentators. However industrious the student, and however excellent his authorities in each of these departments, he laboured perforce under the disadvantage of piecemeal learning, now confused by fundamental contradictions, now left entirely in the lurch as if by mutual consent. It is hardly necessary to say that such works as Mr. Gladstone's 'Primer' could not fill the gap, while Hartley Coleridge's *Introduction to the Study of the Greek Poets* is long out of date.

Conciseness, with all its drawbacks, being granted as an absolute necessity for learners, Professor Jebb's handbook is as good as it well could be. Within the limits, and with the aim, to which he rigorously confines himself, we do not of course look for any very novel views or surprising theories ; we expect, and we find, a clear and lucid statement of the most approved results of criticism, informed and illustrated by their passage through a mind of singular tact and delicacy of judgment. In no part of the book is this more conspicuous than in the first chapter on 'General Characteristics,' which is full of acute and instructive remarks on the position of the Epic, whether as *Volksepos* or learned poem, in the history of literature. The whole chapter is a model of quiet and luminous criticism.

Passing lightly over the next two chapters, on 'the Homeric World' and 'Homer in Antiquity,' both excellent specimens of accurate condensation, based in the main, of

course, on the works of Helbig and the Königsberg school respectively, I would earnestly recommend the fourth, on 'the Homeric Question,' to the consideration of all English scholars.

Professor Jebb has definitely and boldly thrown in his lot with the adherents of what has been not unhappily called the 'Crystallization theory,' the hypothesis of a primitive epic of the Wrath of Achilles expanded by the insertion of many lays of various compass by later hands. 'The substance of the primary *Iliad*' is to be found in books 1, 11, and 16 to 22 inclusive—'allowance being made for later interpolations, large or small, in books 16-22.' The group of books 2 to 7 'represents the earliest series of additions made (not all at one time or by one hand) to the primary *Iliad*.' Books 12 to 15 are 'a skilful and brilliant expansion,' 'thoroughly worthy of a great poet' (though I cannot at all agree with Mr. Jebb in regarding these books as even possibly the work of one hand ; in no part of the *Iliad* is the narrative more uneven and complicated than here). When the additions had reached this point, no further amplification of the original simple plot would be possible ; for the space between 11 and 16 was now filled with events, while any further retardation between 1 and 11 would be tedious. Hence the artifice of 'duplicating' the turning-point of the story, the discomfiture of the Greeks, by the insertion of books 8 and 9—book 10 did not yet exist.

With regard to 23 and 24 the case is different. 'They are concerned with a subject always of extreme interest to Greek hearers—the rendering of due burial rites.' If they are viewed simply in relation to the plot, 'there is no reason why they should not have belonged to the primary *Iliad* itself. It is the internal evidence of language and style which makes this improbable.' Book 24, Professor Jebb thinks, may possibly be by the author of book 9, to which 'it forms a brilliant antithesis.' All these books must be older than *circ.* 850-800 B.C., while the remaining book, 10, and the 'greater interpolations' may be referable, perhaps, to *circ.* 750-600 B.C. Under the 'greater interpolations' Professor Jebb in-

cludes the episode of Phoenix in 9; the interview between Nestor and Patroclus, 11 596-848 'or at least so much of it as is comprised in 665-762' (the earlier part of it is surely essential to the primitive poem); the making of the armour in 18; the Theomachia in 20, 4-380 (to this should be added also the actual Theomachy in 21, 383-514); the funeral games in 23; and the Catalogue, by a Boeotian poet of the Hesiodic school, in 2, 484-779.

The view thus summarily condensed coincides, *im grossen und ganzen*, so completely with my own belief that I have no wish to criticize it, and can only gratefully welcome the appearance of so powerful a champion on the side of what I hold to be the truth. A matter of more importance, however, is this very significant indication of the tendency of modern Homeric criticism to rally, after many years of independent and mutually destructive combat, round a single standard. All the best recent work has been converging towards agreement; in the general spirit in which they view the *Iliad*, Naber, Sittl, Niese, Christ, Fick, however discordant in details, are really allies, as against the Right of the Unitarians and the Extreme Left of the *Lachmannianer*. Even Hentze, as appears from the preface to the last published part of his *Iliad* (the third edition of books vii.-ix.) has at length given up his belief that 8 and 9 belong to the original poem, and will probably be found in the same camp in a few months. Then there will at last be something like concord in the modern school. The fundamental point to be settled is the original sequence of books 1-11-16; if that is once admitted, all other differences are insignificant.

With regard to the place of origin of the poems Professor Jebb is a modified adherent of the 'European' theory, holding that at least the primary *Iliad* was composed in Greece proper, not in Asia Minor—which however he regards as the birthplace of 2-7 and *a fortiori* of all the later books. Here he seems to me to lay too much stress upon the supposed knowledge of Asia Minor which the poets of 2-7 show. It would have been more satisfactory if he had indicated this in somewhat greater detail. I can recollect no important indication of such knowledge in these books except in late portions of the second. The names of towns in the Troad are familiar even to the author of book 1, and Sarpedon and his Lycians, as Christ has shown, are by no means an integral part of the story where they occur. The only really striking instance of local knowledge in the

whole *Iliad* is the allusion to the fact that the plain of Troy can be seen from the top of Samothrace; and that occurs in a passage which for many reasons must be considered late (xiii. 12-14). The other natural features mentioned in the note on p. 148 are not distinctive of any locality. Here again, however, it is more pleasant to welcome agreement than to accentuate differences; and even the ultimate reference of but a small part of the *Iliad*, as a poem, to Europe is an important *point d'appui* for a fresh examination of the evidence. It does not seem probable to me, however, that we have to look to Thessaly; with the single exception of Achilles, an indispensable *datum* of the legend, the important heroes all belong to S. Greece and the islands; it is Argos and the Argives, as Cleisthenes complained, not the Myrmidons, who are glorified. The little linguistic evidence there is points to the Peloponnesus; the affinities of the non-Ionic forms are with the Cyprian-Arcadian rather than with the Thessalian. Compare for instance Cyprian and Homeric *πτόλις* with Thessalian *πτόλις*.

The book contains appendices treating of 'the House at Tiryns,'—a condensation of Professor Jebb's recent paper in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* rather too polemical and long for the general character of the book, but in the main I think right—and of various linguistic points; and closes with a useful list of books. Instead of discussing these at length, it will be more useful to note a few corrections for future editions. On page 1 the 'songs on the death of a beautiful youth' are not very happily cited as instances of Indo-European Nature worship. Of the five names given as belonging to such hymns one, Linus, is probably Semitic (as Professor Jebb himself points out on the next page), and another, Adonis, patently so: and whatever we may think of Hyacinthus and Hylas, Ialemus at least does not wear a very 'Indo-European' look. The Simonides who quotes Homer (p. 88) is not for certain he of Ceos; Bergk for instance thinks it was Simonides of Amorgos, thus throwing back the date of the quotation 160 years. On p. 141, note 2, Nauck's *σκηπτόοχος* for *σκηπτούχος* cannot be quoted for the restoration of a medial *ς*. On p. 185 the argument that the suggested derivation of modern Greek *ρόυγα* from low Latin *ruga* (rather than from the Homeric *ῥῶγες*) 'fails to carry *ρόυγα* far enough back' surely begs the question, which on the evidence cannot be regarded as other than quite open. It is misleading to say that the digamma in the Aeolic alphabet 'kept its

place far into the historical age' (p. 140); in the Aeolic inscriptions properly so called—those of Aeolis in Asia Minor—the digamma is of course unknown. The statement is correct only if 'Aeolic' be taken in the wide sense to include the dialects of Boeotia, Elis, Thessaly, etc., an extension of the word which is much to be deprecated; or if it means that in the historic age there were still MSS. of the old Aeolic poets in which the $\tilde{\nu}$ was written (see Meister, *Gr. Dialekte*, pp. 103 ff.) The *Iliad* and *Odyssey* consist of not 'nearly,' but considerably more than, 15,000 and 12,000 lines respectively (p. 5, note 3). Of mere misprints, on p. 30, l. 18, *Iliad* 16 should be *Iliad* 17: p. 87, note 1, l. 7 one 'Chios' should be 'Rhodos': p. 194, V. (d) the omission of $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ after $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ makes the metrical remark unintelligible. On p. 201, l. 25 read *Turici* for *Turin*, and l. 36, *Danish* for *Dutch*. A few still smaller slips might be noticed; but it is superfluous to say that not one of them detracts sensibly from the claim of the book to be a trustworthy and indispensable guide to the study of the two great poems.

WALTER LEAF.

Select Private Orations of Demosthenes, with Introductions and English Commentary, by F. A. PALEY, M.A., and J. E. SANDYS, Litt.D. Second edition, 1886.

AN edition which for eleven years has been in the hands of all English scholars requires no long notice. Messrs. Paley and Sandys' *Demosthenes* already takes rank as a standard work, and it will be sufficient to indicate the chief alterations, almost all of them, we may say at the outset, improvements, in the reprint now before us. If less ambitious as a contribution to classical philology than Shilleto's monumental edition of the *De Falsa Legatione*, it is in some respects more useful to the student. A generation which has learnt to admit the incompleteness and occasional fallibility of Porson's method of editing may, without ceasing to honour the memory of Shilleto, recognise the limitations of his mind. Exact as he was in verbal scholarship, skilled in the handling of MSS. and wonderfully versed in the phraseology of the orators, there were yet whole departments of antiquity which, owing to the incessant demands on his time, remained closed to his view. Thus he falls far short of Messrs. Paley and Sandys, as well in minute knowledge of Grecian history, so important for explaining obscure allusions and fixing the date of controverted speeches, as in their

many-sided presentment of ancient life and manners, drawn from the resources of wide archaeological study. In dealing with the orators it is much, of course, to come after A. Schaefer, Blass, and Prof. Jebb; and besides these, such works as the *Attische Process* (with the additional notes by J. H. Lipsius), Schoemann's *Antiquities* and the new edition of Hermann's *Antiquities* as far as published (e.g. Thalheim's volume on Greek law), Caillemet's detached *Études*, Büchsen-schütz's *Besitz und Erwerb*, and Becker's *Charicles* in Göll's recension, have been freely used, and add greatly to the interest of this edition. In part ii. more especially, the latest German monographs have been laid under contribution. The new edition of Boeckh's *Public Economy*, by Fränkl, appeared just too late to be of service.

Though the type remains the same, the second edition is still more attractively got up than its predecessor. We are met at once by an excellent autotype plate of illustrative coins, with descriptive letterpress by Mr. Sandys; an improvement for which we have to thank the liberality of the University Press. We naturally turn to see what use has been made, in part i., of Prof. Joseph Mayor's criticisms in the *Journal of Philology*, vi. 240–252. Most of his corrections are thankfully accepted; in some cases, as in *Pantaen.* p. 971, § 16, the editorial dignity is saved by a show of resistance, while substantially conceding the point at issue. On *Boeot. de Dot.* p. 1018, § 33, the note on $\mu\eta\delta\epsilon\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\delta\iota\kappa\omicron\upsilon\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ is re-written with reference to Mr. Mayor, but with no notice of the strong probability in favour of $\omicron\delta\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\iota$, actually found in MSS. of authority (e.g. in F). The encroachments of $\mu\eta$ on $\omicron\delta$ in later ages are well known. In the same speech, p. 1021, § 42, the Attic usage $\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}\ \tau\acute{\iota}$ = $\delta\iota\grave{\alpha}\ \tau\acute{\iota}$ is treated (controversially, too) as equivalent to the much rarer pleonasm of $\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}$ where we should expect the simple accusative ($\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\ \acute{\alpha}\delta\iota\kappa\acute{\alpha}$, *Timocr.* p. 710, § 32). On *Dionysod.* p. 1292, § 32, and p. 1293, § 37, the certain corrections of Cobet might have been defended in a note and not merely quoted as various readings; in the latter passage the primitive hand $\sigma\omega\varsigma\ \epsilon\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\iota$ lies but half hidden in the tautology $\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omega\sigma\tau\alpha\iota\ \kappa\grave{\alpha}\ \epsilon\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\iota\ \sigma\omega\phi\alpha$. In one or two passages we offer suggestions of our own. Prof. Mayor's rendering of $\sigma\alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon\pi\iota\eta\theta\eta$ (*Dionysod.* p. 1285, § 8) may, we think, be slightly improved upon. The context alludes to the practice of changing the destination of corn-ships in accordance with advices after they had sailed, the natural effects of which would be, not merely

to raise prices where corn was cheap, but to lower them where it was dear; this is *συντιμᾶν*, 'to bring prices to a level, produce an equilibrium.' This did not suit the Athenians, who wanted an artificial cheapness at the expense of speculators, and made, not only the exportation of corn, but its consignment to any other port than Athens a capital offence (*Adv. Pharm.* p. 918, § 37, with Sandys' note). The law was of course disregarded in the pursuit of gain, as the references show: and the present passage is interesting as a proof of greater talent for business on the part of the Greeks than they have sometimes been credited with. Again, we are not disposed to agree with Mr. Sandys (*Introd.* p. lxi. and note on p. 1270 § 41) that the case of Conon was probably tried before the Forty, sitting as a jury. We conceive that the *τετταράκοντα* were petty magistrates, not dicasts in the ordinary sense; and that a case in which the plaintiff Ariston had been half-killed must have gone before a regular heliastic court, with at least 201, more probably 501, jurors.

W. WAYTE.

Thirteen Satires of Juvenal, with a Commentary by JOHN E. B. MAYOR, M.A. Vol. I. Fourth edition, revised, vol. ii. Third edition, revised. Macmillan, 1886.

It is no exaggeration to say that since Casaubon no scholar has presented so remarkable a combination as Prof. John Mayor of two qualities seldom found in the same person, wealth of learning and freshness of interest. His commentary on Juvenal, long so justly admired for its abundance of illustration, is a work whose importance extends far beyond the limits imposed by the requirements of textual or explanatory criticism of his author. Just as one learns far more of ancient life from Casaubon's Persius than from Persius himself, so the present writer has often felt that he has learned more of Juvenal's age from Mr. Mayor's commentary than from Juvenal.

The new edition before us contains a large number of new notes; a new index of phrases printed at the end of the first volume; and a new preface, in which the author notices (among other things), the chief additions recently made to our knowledge of the text, notably under the auspices of Beer and Bücheler. The new index, which has evidently cost its author immense pains, will prove of great value. In the preface, Mr. Mayor, as though drawn into the spirit of a

writer whose motto is *quicquid agunt homines, votum timor ira voluptas, Gaudia, discursus*, has a good deal of miscellaneous discourse, ranging over temperance, vegetarianism, vivisection, and the management of college estates. The intention of the author is admirable, nay noble, and he only emphasizes teaching now heard on all hands. Yet, amid the thousand calls upon us, so specious, so popular, to attend (for moral reasons) to bodily health, one is occasionally tempted to ask whether, after all, we have not forgotten a once familiar text, *Ideo dico vobis ne solliciti sitis animae vestrae, quid manducetis*.

But apart from its discursiveness, few things can be imagined more inspiring and suggestive than this preface. For, while Mr. Mayor is a scholar of the first order, the moral elevation of his character prevents him from being a self-isolating student. In the light of his almost prophetic enthusiasm, the advance of knowledge is seen to be what it really is, and what we hope it may one day be generally thought in England, an element of moral advancement. Philology and natural science belong, of course, to all countries; yet in view of the wide diffusion of the English language, it is most important that we should have original works in both departments of knowledge written in English and from an English point of view. Our debt to Germany, it is true, can never be repaid. But there is much in what Jacob Bernays once said to the writer of this article; "Do not translate our books, write afresh in your own language, and from within your own circle of ideas." No one has done more than Mr. Mayor to aid us towards the realization of this object.

Mr. Mayor's book still suffers from the imperfection of its form. The pages on the life of Juvenal (vol. ii. pp. xi.—xx.) should have been transposed to the beginning of the first volume, and the new index to the end of the second.

The new readings, catalogued p. xlvi. and onwards, will have to be carefully studied by all Latin scholars. The most important and interesting one, proved beyond all doubt by ancient evidence, is in 8, 148, *ipse rotam adstringit sufflamine mulio consul* for *multo sufflamine consul*. But *auditor saturarum* for *adiutor* (3, 322): *perit hic plus temporis atque olei plus* for *petit* (7, 99): *inde Dolabellae atque istine Antonius* for *hinc* (8, 105) are also, in their several ways, great improvements.

With regard to the life of Juvenal, the new edition adds nothing to the pages printed in the previous edition at the beginning of

vol. ii., in which the evidence is collected, but not sifted. It may be worth while briefly to indicate the present position of the question. First, we have the inconsistent tradition given by the manuscript biographies, which agree that Juvenal practised declamation till middle age, but leave us in doubt whether he was born in the reign of Claudius or of Nero, and which, while saying that he was banished from Rome, differ as to the time and place of banishment: one account relegating him to Britain and another to Egypt: one dating the event in Domitian's reign, and assigning it to the anger of the *pantomimus* Paris, the other deferring it to the age of Trajan.

The story of the offence given by Juvenal to Paris may well have arisen from the text of the seventh satire (vv. 87—90), though it seems to derive some support from the lines of Sidonius Apollinaris; *Nec qui consimili deinde casu. Ad vulgi tenuem stupentes auram Irati fuit histrionis exul.* But, secondly, the often-quoted inscription of Aquinum is cited as adding to the probability of Juvenal's banishment to Britain. Why? Because the Decimus Junius Juvenalis there mentioned was *tribunus* or *praefectus* (the word is lost and we cannot therefore ascertain which) of a *cohors Delmatarum*. Now in 103, 105, and 124 A.D., we know that there were *cohortes Delmatarum* in Britain. But, before we infer anything from this, we must remember that there is no positive evidence that the Juvenalis of the inscription is our Juvenal at all: and also that there was a *cohors Delmatarum* (the fifth) in Germany in 116 A.D., with which the *cohors* mentioned in the inscription may be identified on just as good grounds as with those in Britain.

It would seem then that neither the inscription nor the biographies help us much. What then do we know? We know that Juvenal wrote his thirteenth satire either in 107 or in 119 A.D. For the consulship of Fonteius is there dated sixty years back, and Fonteius must be the consul either of 67 or of 59 A.D. The second satire was written not very long after Agricola's British campaigns, and probably after the death of Domitian (A.D. 96). Thus we get a space of thirty-one or at least of twenty-three years between the second and thirteenth satires: and there are allusions in the first, sixth, and eighth satires to events occurring from 100 to 116 A.D.

The evidence is not complete without a consideration of the relation between Juvenal and Martial. That they were intimate friends we know from Martial himself; more than this, it can easily be shown that they sym-

pathize in their views of literature, they describe the same world, they talk of the same persons, or (if this be denied) they largely employ the same fictitious names; and, finally, their diction and turns of expression correspond in a remarkable manner. These points will, I hope, be made good with chapter and verse in a future number of the *Journal of Philology*; meanwhile it should be observed that there seems to have been the same kind of personal and literary intimacy between Juvenal and Martial as existed between Vergil and Horace, Calvus and Catullus. It is difficult to resist the conclusion that Juvenal must have begun to write, if not to publish, satires at least as early as the late years of Domitian's reign. It is urged that the biographies make Juvenal a *declamator* up to middle age, and that Martial, writing as late as 92 A.D., calls him *facundus*; Martial therefore, it is inferred, only knew Juvenal as a *declamator*. But the word *facundus* proves nothing. It is several times used, by good writers, of literary eloquence (Horace, *A.P.* 41, Statius *Silvae*, 1, 4, 28—30, Martial, 5, 30, 3: 14, 185). The most natural conclusion seems to be, taking into consideration all the facts, that Juvenal wrote his earlier satires in the later years of Domitian's reign, and retouched them after the emperor's death.

And now comes the really interesting question. Do Juvenal's satires give a faithful representation of his social surroundings? Mr. Mayor would, it seems, be inclined to answer yes. 'Not in Seneca,' he says, 'not in Martial, not in Plutarch, Lucian, the younger Pliny, the anthology, do we find such a panorama of the world under the empire, its beliefs, traditions, education, fashions, hopes and fears.' No doubt Mr. Mayor is right in maintaining, as against the exaggerations of Boissier, that Juvenal is honest. But surely the satires (like other satires since his time) are not so much a panorama of the world as a chamber of horrors filled with figures notorious in the society of the capital, the exhibitor being, let us remember, a provincial whose means did not allow him to move in the highest society on equal terms. An honest moralist might, at the present day, easily make up an exciting novel out of the reports of trials in the Central Criminal Court or the Divorce Court. He might dignify his proceeding with the name of realism. But who, except the realists, would accept his work as a faithful picture of life?

Juvenal's honesty need not be denied: but it is impossible to deny either that his pictures are incoherent and strongly rhetorical,

or that his morality is largely tinged with social prejudice. A nobleman fighting as a gladiator is to him a more monstrous spectacle than a flagrant case of unnatural vice (2, 143). Nero's crimes in the eighth satire begin with the murder of his mother and relations, and end with his love of music and the drama. Again, Juvenal (unlike Seneca) has nothing to say against slavery or against the games of the amphitheatre: and for philosophy he seems to have a feeling not very unlike contempt.

Space compels us to conclude with these remarks a very scanty and inadequate notice of a great book. It only remains to express the hope that Mr. Mayor may soon complete his commentary on the second, sixth, and ninth satires. Unquestionably the sixth is Juvenal's greatest effort; and Mr. Mayor is not writing for the young.

H. NETTLESHIP.

A. Persii Flacci D. Iunii Iuvenalis Sulpiciae Saturae. Recognovit OTTO IAHN. Editio altera curata a FRANCISCO BÜCHELER. Berolini: 1886.

THIS edition of the Roman Satirists is a reprint of the Otto Iahn of 1868, but a reprint with such material additions and working in the results of so much new research, as almost to claim the title of a new book. Not that Prof. Bücheler has deserted the lines or the external form of his predecessor; for the *apparatus criticus* is still simple and the new editor's personality is rarely obtruded on the reader. Notwithstanding which, the extra matter is of such first-rate importance, as to make a brief notice of it necessary as well as useful.

And first, it contains the scholia both to Persius and Juvenal. What a gain this is will be felt when it is remembered that the editions in which these appear are all more or less difficult to procure. Otto Iahn's larger *Persius* contains the Persius scholia; but it has long been out of print, and sells for fancy prices. His first and larger Juvenal which similarly contains the Juvenal scholia is equally rare. Cramer's separate edition of these latter scholia (it is still the most valuable) is procurable by application to German booksellers, but very rare in England; Heinrich's involves the purchase of an excellent commentary on the Satires, but written in German, and therefore not souseful to ordinary English students. Our thanks are therefore due, nationally, to Prof. Bücheler

for putting within easy reach of the most modest purses this valuable collection of ancient interpretations of two writers among the most obscure in the Latin language. It is certainly true that these obscurities are often left quite unsolved by the scholiasts, and that without the erudite commentaries which modern scholars have ever since the Renaissance been continually producing, we should very often be in complete uncertainty as to the real meaning of Persius or Juvenal: but this is true of all scholia. Meanwhile I may remark that the interest of them is by no means confined to the pure elucidation of difficulties of meaning. They not rarely contain valuable suggestions for the constitution of the text of the Satires, as well as out-of-the-way information, and occasional quotations from lost writers.

To come to the sources of the text. In Persius Iahn's two primary codices were *A*, a Montpellier MS., No. 212, *B*, a Vatican MS., No. 36 H. Bücheler in no way alters this selection of his predecessor: but in 1879 an American Ph.D. of Bonn, by name J. H. Wheeler of Massachusetts, re-examined the MS. carefully at Rome, and placed the results at Bücheler's disposal. They confirm the opinion of Iahn as stated in his *Praefatio* (which is reprinted in this new edition). The third basis for Persius' text, *C*, is the celebrated Montpellier codex Pithoeanus, which (as I have stated in the *Academy*) has within the last few years been submitted to a microscopic examination by another Bonn doctor, Rudolf Beer, whose *Specilegium Iuvenalianum*, published by Teubner in 1885, a short pamphlet of eighty-two pages, is quite indispensable to every student of both satirists. Beer also has placed his collation in Bücheler's hands; and we are now able to speak with certainty of the readings of this MS., which has never before been possible, as Iahn's readings were not drawn from a personal inspection; nor was the period when he published them so exacting in respect of minuteness as the present. It is in Juvenal that *P* is of most importance. Here Iahn is followed by Bücheler in making *P* generally the basis of his text; but since Iahn's days research has brought to light some other *fontes* which are of first-rate importance. These are (1) the schedae Arovienses or Aarau fragments, five leaves which were used as the bindings of books belonging to the library of some Aarau nuns. The whole amount contained is between 420—430 verses, a small fraction of the whole number of lines in Juvenal, but interesting as representing the same

recension as *P*. (2) The Florilegium Sangallense, No. 870 at St. Gallen, examined by Stephan, see Rhein. Mus. xl. p. 263. This supplies one capital variant which Bücheler for the first time prints in his text, viii. 148.

‘Ipse rotam astringit sufflamine mulio
consul’

for *multo sufflamine* of most MSS. and edd. This reading is accepted by Mayor in the Preface to his Fourth Edition, ‘The juxtaposition *mulio consul* is Juvenal all over,’ p. xlviii., and is supported by the schol. on viii. 157 and by a grammarian in Keil’s Gramm. Latin. vi. p. 231. (3) The Bobbian palimpsest fragments in the Vatican, first examined by Mai, later by Du Rieu, within the last few years again by Löwe, whose transcript has been published at Iena as a programme by Götz, 1884. There are two leaves; one contains Pers. i. 53—78, 79—104: the other Juv. xiv. 323, xv. 17, xv. 18—43.

In addition to all these Bücheler introduces to our notice for the first time a hitherto neglected claimant, Paris 9345 of cent. xi., which at the end of Sat. 6 has this subscription, *decem iuvenalis explicit lib. secundus incipit lib. iii. legente Aepicarpio scribentis Exuperantio servo*. This Servian recension is at present matter for conjecture, and must remain so till research has gone farther.

In a short notice it is not possible to do more than notice *some* of the new readings introduced by Bücheler. Many of these are based on *P* and are often convincingly right. Thus in x. 35 where Iahn prints *Prætexta et trabeae fasces lectica tribunal* Bücheler following *P* which gives *Prætexta et trabeae* reads *Prætextae trabeae*, an asyndeton which every one familiar with Juvenal will accept at once. viii. 205 *P* gives *Inde Dolabella atque stinc cantonius inde*, i.e. *atque istinc Antonius*, whereas Iahn, believing that *P* gave *atque hinc* follows Lachmann’s conj. *atque dehinc*. I own myself perfectly convinced again by the new reading of viii. 67 *Sequipedes dignique molam versare nepotes*; the degenerate descendants of the high bred race-horse would in this Satire on aristocracy very appropriately be called his grand-children. What indeed is the ‘myth of Nepos’? I hope it may vanish from Mayor’s text as it has from Bücheler’s. iii. 322 *P* gives *Auditor* (Satirarum) for that venerable tradition *Adiutor* which has so often puzzled undergraduates. Mayor rightly accepts *Auditor*. I would suggest as an illustrative parallel the words of Martial Praef. xii. *Si*

quid est enim quod in libellis meis placeat, dictavit auditor. More than probable too is x. 150 *Rursus ad Aethiopum populos aliosque elephantos* for *altosque*: but here the new reading is not in *P*, and is so far less certain. It is probably on the strength of Priscian’s citation that Bücheler has admitted it: though internal considerations are here certainly of very great weight, also: for with *alios* as an alternative few, probably, would prefer *altos*: the former an artificial touch quite in the style of the period, the latter rather flat and meaningless.

It seems strange that our editor should, after thus showing that he is no slave to a single dominant codex, accept its reading in x. 93 *Principis angusta Caprearum in rupe sedentis*. I hold it to be certain that Juvenal would never have been guilty of so strange a perversion of taste as to use ironically a word which would by its sound suggest the natural, almost the inevitable opposite *angusta*. Nor can I accept *P*’s reading in v. 38 *inaequales berullos Virro tenet phiala*, which seems in point of construction unexampled.

Passing to conjectures, I would signalise x. 54 *Ergo superuacua aut quae perniciosa petuntur? Propter quae fas est genua incerrare deorum?* the two questions denoting two different classes of vows, the undesirable and the safe. This is ingenious; but not much in Juvenal’s manner. I should prefer to add *si* after *aut*, ‘if there are useless or dangerous prayers, what are legitimate?’ In the difficult passage vi. 167 *Malo Venusinam quam te Cornelia mater Gracchorum*, Bücheler conj. *Venustinam*, but I have not found his support of the name in his discussion of Juvenalian passages in Rhein. Mus. xxxv. pp. 390 sqq. It looks, however, as if it ought to be right, though the scholiast appears to have read the metrically desperate *Venusinam*.

This new edition, on the whole, marks an advance in the criticism of the Satires; it must give to the study of them that new interest which springs from a very careful presentation of the readings of the primary MSS. Yet it cannot be final: for Bücheler having told us much, we naturally ask for more. English scholars in especial, who in Mayor’s edition can claim to have produced the most erudite commentary on any Latin author published since the seventeenth century, will of course be sceptical even as to *mulio consul*, and far more as to the other novelties they will find in the new text.

I venture to offer here a conj. which occurred to me in reading Sat. i. 135, 6

‘Optima siluarum interea pelagique uorabit
Rex horum uacuisque toris *stantum* ipse
iacebit,’

instead of *tantum* which MSS. give. Exactly similar is the opposition of *stare* and *recumbere* in v. 65, though there it is the slave who stands while the guests recline: here it is the master who reclines, while the guests who ought to be there are standing outside.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

SHORTER NOTICES.

Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur von ihren Anfängen bis auf die Zeit der Ptolemäer. Von FERDINAND BENDER. Leipzig: W. Friedrich. 1886. Pp. xii. 762.

SCHOLARS will find nothing new or of special interest to them in Herr Bender's work. Written for those who know little or no Greek, it consists largely of translations, poetical versions, by various hands, and summaries of the masterpieces of Greek literature. The critical and historical matter, generally sound, has no independent value. The author claims to have elucidated the development of Greek literature, but does not seem to me to have added anything to what was already known on the subject, and does not see the relation of the oral nature of the literature to its development. In his preface he hopes to be excused for having devoted more space to the poets than to the prose writers: but this is no excuse for the absence of all appreciation for the literary charm of Thucydides, or for the absence of all attempt to estimate the style of Aristotle. His attitude towards the Homeric question is inconsistent with itself: his criticism of Aristophanes shallow and inadequate. The book seems to have been somewhat hastily put together, and the author apparently has sometimes found the mass of his materials too much for him. On the other hand, measured by the purpose for which it is designed, the book has several good points. The style is light and interesting (for a German work); the chapters on the Lyric poets are discerning and appreciative; Herr Bender neither starts nor adopts any wild theories; he has managed to include in his 760 pages nearly everything that the class of readers to whom he addresses himself ought to know; and any danger of weariness, which seems according to English notions to be portended by the size of the book, will be due to its length, not to its depth.—F. B. JEVONS.

L. Annaei Senecae dialogorum libros xii ad codicem praecipue Ambrosianum recensuit M. C. GERTZ. Hauniae, Gyldendal, 1886. 8vo. pp. xxxiii 443.

THE author once hoped to publish the whole of Seneca. If possible, he will take next the epistles. He has been enabled to bring out this instalment of his task only by the liberality of Fr. Hegel, the head of the Gyldendal firm, which had already (1874) published his *Studia critica in L. Annaei Senecae dialogos*. To Weidmann in Berlin we are indebted for the publication of his edition of the *de ben.* and *de clem.* (1876).

The volume is dedicated to J. N. Madvig and J. L. Ussing, ‘praeceptoribus, collegis, amicis.’ When H. A. Koch's edition of the dialogues was edited by Vahlen in 1879, Gertz tested Koch's collation of the Ambrosian MS. by his own notes

taken in 1878. Finding many discrepancies in the two collations, in 1882 he carefully collated the MS. throughout, in many places two or three times, and now confidently declares that where he and Koch differ, as they often do, his own report is to be trusted, except perhaps in a few orthographical details.

The preface gives a full account of the Ambrosian MS. and its various correctors and orthography.¹ For the books *de ira* Gertz gives the readings of L. (cod. Laurent. 76, 32, saec. xiii). Conjectures, ancient and modern, to 1885, are most exactly recorded in the critical commentary, which also contains several grammatical notes and emendations of the two Senecas, Q. Curtius, Quintilian and Plin. ep. *Index prior* ‘ea continet, quae in rebus et maxime quidem in sermone memorabilia mihi visa sunt, et de quibus plerumque vel in commentario critico et praefatione vel in locis “Studiorum criticorum” ibi laudatis disputatum est.’ *Index posterior* ‘eo pertinet, ut genera causasque errorum in A commissorum demonstret.’ The former will be of interest to lexicographers, the latter to palaeographers.

Doubtless this volume supersedes Koch's, and will always be valued for its exact collation of our chief authority for the text of these books. Bücheler has given us a trustworthy text of the *ludus de morte Claudii* and of the later epistles, and promises an edition of the whole of Seneca for Teubner's *bibliotheca*. Still it is to be hoped that Gertz may be enabled to complete his undertaking; it is a field in which much remains to be done and the labourers are few, as Madvig complained.

I select one passage, where I cannot agree with the editor's conjecture (*de otio* 3 § 3, p. 256):

Si res publica corruptior est, quam ut adiuvari possit, . . . non nitetur sapiens in superuacuum nec se nihil profuturus impendet; si parum habebit auctoritatis aut uirum nec illum erit admissura res publica, si ualetudo illum impedit, quomodo nauem quassam non deduceret in mare, quomodo nomen in militiam non daret debilis, sic ad iter quod inhabilis erit, non accedet.

The critical note on the last line runs:

Ad iter, quod inhabilis erit scripsi (ad iter quo inhabilem se sciet Madvig); ad iter quod inhabile sciet A. quod per se defendi potest, ut ostendit Mayor in *Journal of Philology*, vii. p. 51 sq., hic uero uix potest, cum non tam de itineris difficultate quam de sapientis infirmitate nunc agatur.

I still adhere to the MS. reading. ‘The sage will not essay a road which he knows to be impracticable,’ is the same thing as ‘the sage will not essay a road, for which he is too weak.’ Just above it is not said ‘as he would not put to sea if ignorant of seamanship,’ but ‘as he would not launch a crazy bark,’ so here the impossibility of the task justifies the sage in declining it, quite as much as bodily infirmity would do. If any change is needed read *quod inhabile* [esse] *Sciēt.*—J. E. B. M.

NOTES.

GREEK FROGS.

Βρεκεκεκὲξ κοῦξ κοῦξ.

Aristophanes, *Ranæ*, 209.

It must often have occurred to English readers of Aristophanes that the well-known line which I have placed at the head of this note, does not represent the croak of the common frog with which we are familiar in England. Some explanation of the discrepancy is clearly required; but all the commentators whom I have consulted, Mitchell, Fritzsche, Koek, Paley, Green, and Merry, are silent on the subject. During a visit to Greece in the Easter vacation of last year, I happened to have an opportunity of verifying the accuracy of the sounds used by the comic poet in imitation of the music of the marsh. While walking from Tiryns to Nauplia, as I passed a clump of tall reeds, my attention was arrested by a clamorous noise resembling that of a number of paroquets engaged in a persistent quarrel. It was obviously the croaking of the Greek frog that I now heard for the first time—a series of four short guttural syllables followed by a double quack. In English letters it may perhaps be best represented by *kek-kék-kóik-kóik*. I failed to catch either the initial *br*, or the final *s*, of the Aristophanic line; but the general resemblance was unmistakable.

Having since had occasion to consult, for another purpose, a number of works on Greek travel, I have found the following passages which may be of interest in this connexion:—

'The common frogs of Greece,' says Doellwell, 'have a note totally different from that of the frogs of the northern climates, and there cannot be a more perfect imitation of it than the *brokekekke koue koue* of Aristophanes.' *Classical and Topographical Tour through Greece*, ii 45, ed. 1819.

Again Mure, when travelling along the banks of the ancient Balyra, the chief river of the Messenian valley, observes with fuller detail: 'Here it was that I first had my attention called to the peculiar croak of the Greek frog, which now began with advancing spring to be heard in the marshy grounds, and which, while not altogether strange to my ear, struck me at the same time as different from that of the same animal in any other country where I had happened to hear it. It consists of two varieties of note, the first of which cannot be better described than by comparing it to the familiar sound made between the tongue and the gum or palate, in order to excite the speed of horses. The second is a mixture of a croak and a quack. These two sounds . . . succeed each other at intervals with great regularity, the first being repeated rather oftener than the second; nor were it possible to convey them more accurately to the apprehension by written language than has been done by the *brokekekke koue, koue*, of Aristophanes. This coincidence caused me a sort of gratification which none but an enthusiastic Hellenist will be able to appreciate; and the song of these 'sons of the morass' formed a most agreeable relief in the sequel to many a dreary hour's march on the swampy plains of the coast of Elis.'—*Tour*, ii 263, 1842.

Lastly, in the late Mr. W. G. Clark's account of his tour with the late Master of Trinity, then Professor of Greek at Cambridge, I find the following description of their return from the Lernaean Marsh to the plain of Argos: 'A multitude of frogs assailed

us with a pertinacious chorus, in notes much louder and harsher than the notes of the frogs of England. They begin with an inarticulate preparatory sound, like an old Dutch clock groaning in the effort to strike, and end with a succession of spluttering quacks. The frog language cannot be better rendered into articulate speech than by the *Brokekekke koue koue* of Aristophanes.'—*Peloponnesus*, p. 103.

The scientific name of the common English frog is *rana temporaria*; but the Greek frog, as I learn from Mr. Alfred Newton, Professor of Zoology in the University of Cambridge, is the *rana esculenta*, the edible frog of southern Europe. I find, however, that, according to the *Expédition Scientifique de Morée*, its croak differs to some extent from that of the same species in France. 'La Commission de Morée a cru remarquer que son cri n'était pas tout-à-fait le même que celui des Grenouilles de nos environs. Les Grecs ne mangent point la chair de cet animal, au contraire, ils témoignent autant de dégoût que pour toute autre sorte de Reptiles.'—*Séction des Sciences Physiques*, III i p. 74, 1833.—J. E. SANDYS.

THE VASES FROM THERA.—The vases from Thera are at present generally dated about 1700 B.C. The date is obtained in this way. The vases were found under three layers of lava; this lava must have flowed down from the former volcanic cone over the bay between Thera and Therasia: the collapse of the cone would have been recorded, had it occurred after our records for Thera begin; our records for Thera begin about 1500 B.C.; so that the vases, having existed before the third eruption prior to the collapse of the cone some time before 1500 B.C., may be dated about 1700 B.C. Several objections may be taken, and particularly two. First, such a convulsion as the collapse of the cone would have demolished the vases and the buildings containing them, had these existed then. Secondly, the vases were found, not under lava, but under pumice; and although the alleged lava must have flowed down from the former great cone over the bay, the actual pumice might have been shot up from the present little cones in the bay; and many eruptions of these are recorded from 197 B.C. onwards. It might be well to take a millennium or so off the received date.—CORN. TORR.

NEW MATERIALS FOR THE TEXT OF ARISTOTLE'S POLITICS.—Readers of Aristotle's *Politics* will learn with some interest that fragments of books III and IV on a palimpsest in the Vatican library have been collated by Mr. G. Heylbut for the first number of this year's *Rheinisches Museum*. Such fragments were known to exist from Mai's statement in *Script. veter. nova collectio* II p. 581; but he had given no clue to their whereabouts, and it was not until last year that they were accidentally rediscovered on twelve leaves belonging to the second volume of a manuscript of Aristides marked gr. 1298. Mai's chemicals had effectually destroyed the writing above and left the Aristotelian text, except in comparatively few cases, quite legible. The handwriting is said to be of the 10th century: the parchment has thirty-two lines to a page and about forty-seven letters to a line. Abbreviations are seldom used. *Idem adscriptum* is inserted or omitted quite irregularly. The words are not separated, except at pauses in the sense: *ν ἐρεκεκαστινόν* is retained invariably before conso-

nants. The accents are almost entirely left out : but there is one clear case of a circumflex. Corrections are often added by the writer in smaller letters above the line.

The fragments cover five connected passages, in all about one tenth of the *Politics*: viz. III. c. 1 § 5—c. 2 § 3, 1275a 13—b33: c. 4 §§ 1—12, 1276b 17—1277b 1: c. 5 § 6—c. 10 § 5, 1278a 24—1281a 37: c. 15 § 12 to the end of book III., followed by c. 1 §§ 1—5 of book IV (now often reckoned book VI), 1286b 16—1288b 37; lastly c. 4 § 2—c. 5 § 4 of this same book VI (IV), 1290a 36—1292b 20.

It would be natural to expect that such considerable fragments, older by four centuries than any manuscript of the *Politics* hitherto known to exist, would furnish some new readings, or at any rate greatly assist in determining the text. This however is not the case. In spite of their great age the fragments abound in errors of every kind; dittographia, omission of words and clauses by homoeoteleuton, or other accidental causes, and careless orthography. Once they confirm a conjectural emendation, ἀστῶν III. 5 § 8, 1278a 34, which had been proposed by Perizonius: they also omit οὐκ ἔλαττον with the manuscripts of one family, in III. 6 § 3, 1278b 22. We cannot properly assign the fragments to either of the two families, Π¹ or Π², though they side much more often with Π² than with Π¹. Heylbut notes 56 cases of agreement with Π², 9 only of agreement with Π¹. Susemihl on the basis of a more exact enumeration makes the numbers 62 to 27. The inference seems to be that this codex, or its original, belongs to a period anterior to any sharp distinction between the manuscripts of the two families.—R. D. HICKS.

MR. J. H. HESSELS, known by his edition of the *Salic Laws* and by his researches in palaeography and the history of printing, has nearly ready for publication vol. i of the correspondence preserved in the Dutch Church, London. This volume contains letters dating from 1524—1625, nearly all written to or by Abr. Ortelius the famous geographer and his nephew. Four earlier letters are by Erasmus (already printed

by Jortin), Albert Dürer and Guil. Budé. Among eminent names of writers may be specified Benedictus Arias Montanus, Bonav. Vulcanius, Jan Gruter, Frid. Sylburg, Juste Lipse, Andr. Schott; of British worthies Humphrey Llwyd, Dan. Rogers, William Camden, Robert and Hugh Owen, William Soon, John Dee, Richard Mulcaster, William Charke the famous Puritan, Thomas Penny, Richard Hacluyt, John Johnston of St. Andrews. Volume ii, containing letters relating to the Dutch Church, will appear later. The first volume, a stately quarto, printed at the Pitt Press, has summaries prefixed to the letters, critical notes and references at the foot of the page, an introduction, notes, chiefly biographical, and indexes.

M. BERTHELOT, the eminent chemist, who brought out a year and a half ago a work on the *Origins of Alchemy*, is about to issue by subscription a faithful reprint of the oldest known MS. on Alchemy, written in Greek, in the 11th century, from the library of San Marco. In addition to a scientific introduction and notes by M. Berthelot, there will be a French translation and notes on the Greek text by M. Ch. Ruelle. The whole work will comprise some 1200 pages. Only 150 copies will be for sale at a subscription price of 60 francs.

THE library of the late M. CHARLES JOURDAIN, the author of *La Philosophie de St. Thomas d'Aquin*, of *Recherches critiques sur l'Age et l'Origine des Traductions latines d'Aristote*, the editor of Abaelard, the historian of the University of Paris in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, will be sold in Paris early in March. M. Leopold Delisle prefaces the sale catalogue with a memoir of the author, and a list of his numerous independent publications or articles contributed to the *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, and other learned periodicals. M. Jourdain's library was that of a scholar, not of a collector, and, as might be expected, is richest in the department of mediaeval philosophy and of academical history. Catalogues may be had from Mr. Nutt.

UNIVERSITY INTELLIGENCE.

OXFORD.

THE flow of legislation has slackened a little this term. It has been decided by a majority of three to one to substitute simple rotation for the elaborate cycle which has hitherto determined the course of the proctorship through the colleges. Indian and Colonial universities have been qualified as candidates for the privileges of affiliated colleges; that is, a period of residence at one of them may be allowed to compensate for a year of residence at Oxford. The only other important question was one more directly affecting *literae humaniores*. It was proposed that we should, as Cambridge has done, establish a doctorate in Science, and a doctorate in Letters. These degrees were to be awarded by Council on application, subject to the decision of the boards of faculties concerned with the subjects. Roughly

speaking, twenty-eight votes for the measure came from those interested in the degree in science; seventy-six non-placets from those who thought the term 'Letters' too vague—distrusted the boards of faculties—and would prefer a doctorate in Arts, to be conferred on official persons who wish to have it. At present, those who are not specialists are year by year more effectually debarred from the existing doctorate; the faculty of Law is even now shutting its doors; Medicine is already professional; and Theology recognises only the clergy of the Church of England. Of course Natural Science will get its new degree before long, and so will Literature, whenever there is general agreement on the subject.

In the intellectual life of the term, the most remarkable feature is the attention

given to classical archaeology. The professorship is indeed vacant, and (it is needless to say) the election has already been postponed once or twice; but its value is to be increased by the proceeds of a Merton fellowship; and meanwhile Mr. L. R. Farnell, Fellow of Exeter College, is appointed to lecture during the vacancy. He announced three courses: (1) On the Younger Attic School of Sculpture; (2) On the Homeric and Archaic Periods of Greek Art, with reference to the History of Greek Religion; (3) A Special Course of Practical Exercises in the Interpretation of Myths. But he is possibly eclipsed, in the public eye, by Miss Jane E. Harrison, who is lecturing to large audiences on Greek vase-painting. She is at present treating of the Attic myths, of Cecrops and Theseus and the divine and human persons with whom they had to do. Perhaps it is not a mere coincidence that Professor Herkomer has been illustrating and explaining the process of portrait-painting before his class in the new room at the back of the gallery containing our new collection of casts from the antique. It may be that art ancient and modern is soon to take a recognised place among our studies. Nor is this all. The professor of poetry continues his introductory lectures, 'illustrated by examples of sculpture and painting in ancient and modern poetry.'

The Regius Professor of Greek—no longer Vice-Chancellor—is once more lecturing in Balliol College hall, on Pre-Socratic Philosophy. No other man would lecture at one o'clock, or get an audience if he did. Mr. Bywater, as reader in Greek, lectures on Aristotle's Poetics; the Professor of Latin on the Causes of Corruption in Latin Manuscripts, and on the History of Latin Literature from the Earliest Times to the end of the Second Century B.C. Mr. Robinson Ellis, as reader in Latin, teaches the art of Latin verse composition, and treats of passages of Juvenal as modified by recent manuscript research. The Professor of Ancient History takes as his subject the Roman Republic from the time of the Gracchi to the Battle of Actium. Professors Freeman and Sayce are away on the shores of the Mediterranean. Mr. W. W. Capes has unfortunately found himself unable to hold the readership in Ancient History any longer, and has resigned it after sixteen years' successful work. Mr. J. C. Wilson, Fellow of Oriel College, has been appointed examiner in the final honour school of *literae humaniores*. Mr. S. Ball, Mr. G. Wood, Mr. G. F. Lovell, and Mr. G. R. Scott, have been appointed

examiners in the pass classical schools. Mr. J. L. Strachan-Davidson, Fellow of Balliol; Mr. H. F. Tozer, Fellow of Exeter; Mr. T. H. Grose, Fellow of Queen's; Mr. T. Case, Fellow of Corpus; and Mr. T. H. Warren, President of Magdalen, have been elected members of the board of faculties in *literae humaniores*.

The University Classical Scholarships were awarded at the close of last term, and the new regulations for the Craven foundation had their first trial, there being now a travelling fellowship open to graduates, and three scholarships for undergraduates, the first to go to the Ireland scholar. This fell to Mr. Schulhof, formerly scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge, and twelfth in the classical tripos of 1881, who was therefore older than any previous Ireland scholar. The Hertford now follows the Ireland, with two days' interval—a deplorable change, which can only diminish the competition, exhaust the candidates, and make it impossible to judge their merits accurately. The results of these examinations are subjoined:—

Craven Fellow—D. G. Hogarth, Fellow of Magdalen (Winchester).

Ireland and Craven Scholar—J. M. Schulhof, Exhibitioner of Exeter (S. Paul's).

Craven Scholars—G. G. A. Murray, Scholar of S. John's (Merchant Taylors); W. Ashburner, Exhibitioner of Balliol (University College School).

Proxime accessit—J. U. Powell, Scholar of Balliol (Cheltenham).

Accesserunt—G. C. Richards, Scholar of Balliol (Rugby); H. S. Jones, Scholar of Balliol (Rossall); A. B. Poynton, Scholar of Balliol (Marlborough).

Hertford Scholar—H. S. Jones, Scholar of Balliol (Rossall).

Proxime accessit—J. W. Goodrich, Scholar of Balliol (Charterhouse).

Accessit—R. R. Marett, Exhibitioner of Balliol (Victoria College, Jersey).

BALLIOL.

Scholars—R. J. Walker (S. Paul's); F. G. H. Anderson (Bath College); R. W. Lee (Rossall); E. J. Palmer (Winchester).

Exhibitioners—F. Fletcher (Balliol); R. Carter (Balliol), Clifton; A. J. Eagleston (Oxford High School); A. E. Taylor (Kingswood); H. D. Watson (Harrow).

QUEEN'S.

Bible Clerk.—G. D. T. Hope, Lancing.

Exhibitioner.—C. H. Edwards, S. Bees.

NEW COLLEGE.

Scholars.—J. F. Williams, Harrow; A. E. Taylor, Kingswood.

Exhibitioners.—H. Lambert, Eton; A. G. V. Peel (New Coll.), Harrow.

Winchester Scholars.—E. D. Bewley; F. C. Drake; E. F. Davidson; R. T. Warner.

MAGDALEN.

Demics.—A. S. W. Moore, Lancing; C. W. C. Hallett, Cheltenham; J. E. Ferard, Eton; W. R. Elliston, Ipswich; C. C. Inge, Eton.

Exhibitioners.—A. W. Andrews, Charterhouse; H. C. P. Castle, Charterhouse; H. C. Stewart,

Magdalen Coll. Sch.; W. P. Bond, Merchant Taylors'.

CORPUS CHRISTI.

Scholars.—J. B. S. Barratt, Kingswood; H. L. Brackenbury, Leamington; G. E. A. Grindle, Kensington; D. Walker, Bradford; S. E. Winbolt, Christ's Hospital.

Exhibitioner.—A. J. Fowler, Rugby and Sedbergh.

TRINITY.

Scholars.—R. L. A. Du Pontet, S. Paul's; W. A. Way, Christ's Hospital; M. Delevingne, City of London; C. G. Hall, Rossall.

Exhibitioners.—H. Marshall, Eton; A. B. Lowry, Eton; G. L. Calderon, Rugby; C. W. Bell (Trinity), Durham.

Forl Students.—F. A. S. Lowndes, Canterbury; E. T. Packard, Ipswich.

WADHAM.

Scholars.—T. L. Paton, Fettes College; J. K. Hudson (Keble), Macclesfield; A. J. Ford, Sedbergh.

Exhibitioners.—E. H. Pilsbury, Birmingham; A. J. Fowler, Rugby and Sedbergh; G. E. A. Grindle, Kensington; J. H. G. Wilson, York.

WORCESTER.

Scholars.—E. H. Pilsbury, Birmingham; H. A. R. Clark, Merchant Taylors'; L. D. Wainwright, Manchester.

Exhibitioners.—J. Pedder, Bath College; A. E. Thomas, Bath College; J. H. Thursfield, Leamington; F. P. Long, Epsom.

HERTFORD.

Scholars.—L. D. Roberts, Sherborne; C. D. Chambers, Harrow; J. M. Kindersley, Repton; H. W. Firmstone, Rugby.

(*Close*) H. W. Plumtre, Harrow; H. A. Counsell, Worcester Cath. Sch.; H. Capel Cure (Hertford Coll.).

FORTHCOMING SCHOLARSHIP EXAMINATIONS.

A combined examination for open classical scholarships will commence on Wednesday, March 16, 1887, at 9.30 A.M., and end on Saturday, March 19.

Merton College offers two scholarships, one exhibition.

S. John's College offers one scholarship.

Jesus College offers two or three scholarships, one exhibition.

Pembroke College offers two scholarships.

The annual value of a scholarship of Merton, S. John's, and Jesus College is £80; that of the Merton exhibition, £60; that of the Jesus College exhibition, £50.

The scholarships at Pembroke will be worth (1) £100, and about £19 for books, each year; (2) £90 each year. These last are tenable for four years, the rest for two, with renewal of two more if the colleges are satisfied with the industry and good conduct of the holders. Only persons under nineteen years of age are eligible to the scholarship, except at Pembroke, where there is no limit. There is no limit of age for the exhibitions, but the Merton exhibitioner must be in need of assistance at the university.

Candidates are to call on the Head of one of the four colleges on Tuesday, March 15, between 5 and 7 P.M., bringing certificates of birth and character, and (if members of the university) their matriculation papers. They will be required to state the order of preference in which they place the colleges. Rooms may be had on application before March 19. On June 28 there will be another combined examination, when University, Exeter, Oriel, Brasenose, and Christ Church will offer about fourteen open scholarships and several exhibitions. Lincoln College offers three classical scholarships and two exhibitions; the examination commences at 9.30 A.M. on Tuesday, April 19; and there is no limit of age.

Keble College will elect on March 26, 1887, to two classical scholarships, of the value of £80 per annum, tenable for four years. Candidates must be members of the Church of England, and must not have exceeded the age of nineteen years on the day of election. The examination will commence on Tuesday, March 22, and candidates are to call on the Warden on Monday, March 21, after 4 P.M., with testimonials of character and baptismal certificate.

Trinity College will elect a President on March 16, in place of the Head-Master-elect of Rugby, and a Clerical Fellow in the course of the summer term; but names for the latter have to be sent in before March 1.

CAMBRIDGE.

Chancellor's Medals—1. C. Williams, Trinity (Eton); 2. J. L. A. Paton, St. John's (Shrewsbury). Highly distinguished—R. S. Conway, Caius (City of London); Hon. C. M. Knatchbull-Hugessen, King's (Eton); N. Wedd, King's (City of London).

Craven Scholarship—N. K. Stephen, Trinity (Fettes).

Porson Scholarship—not adjudged.

COLLEGES.

FORTHCOMING SCHOLARSHIP EXAMINATIONS.

(N.B.—In all the following Examinations, candidates must be under 19 years of age.)

Trinity Hall—Six Minor Scholarships for Classics or Mathematics, one of £80, one of £60, and the rest of £30; tenable for one year, but capable of being exchanged for a Foundation Scholarship at the end of that time. The Examination will begin on Wednesday, 9th March. Candidates must send in their names, with testimonials of good conduct, and certificates of birth, to the Tutor before 2nd March.

Magdalene College—Two Scholarships of £80, one for Classics, the other for Mathematics, and one Scholarship of £40 for Classics or Mathematics; tenable for two years certain, and capable of extension and augmentation in accordance with the results of

the Annual College Examination. The Examination will begin on Thursday, 10th March. Names, &c., to be sent in to the Tutor before 5th March.

Clare College—Six Scholarships, of value ranging from £80 to £40, for Classics, Mathematics, or Natural Science; tenable for one year, but subject to extension or exchange for Foundation Scholarships. The Examination will begin on Tuesday, 15th March. Names, &c., to be sent to the Tutor before 12th March.

St. Catharine's College—Scholarships, which may be more or less in number, of values varying from £50 to £20 for Classics or Mathematics. The Examination will begin on Tuesday, 26th April. Names, &c., to be sent in to the Tutor before 22nd April.

(The results of Scholarship Examinations at Cambridge will be given in next number.)

THE CAMBRIDGE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.—Dr. Jackson continues president for the present year. The Public Orator is the new vice-president, and the Master of Trinity joins the Council. The executive remains as before, Dr. Peile being treasurer and Dr. Postgate and Mr. Gill as secretaries. The reformed pronunciation of Latin, which has occupied the Society during a great part of the last year, has passed from the stage of theory to that of practice. The scheme, as approved by the Society, has been pub-

lished at a nominal price by the Society's publishers, Messrs. Trübner and Co. It has also been circulated amongst the head-masters at the late Conference, and copies have been sent to the Oxford Philological Society with a view to future combined action. In Cambridge itself a representative committee is engaged in considering the steps to be taken for the general introduction of the reformed pronunciation into Cambridge at the beginning of the Michaelmas term: and it is hoped that this will result in its unanimous adoption throughout the university.

As regards the communications made to the Society, Mr. Tucker, Professor of Classics in the University of Melbourne; sent a number of ingenious emendations of the *Oedipus Coloneus*, the *Helena*, and the *Phoenissae* and of Solon, *εἰς ἑαυτόν*. In the well-known crux of Aesch. *Aj.* 1143, he suggests *ἐγὼ δὲ τέρμονος ταχ' ἐμπελῶ κακῶν*. On Feb. 17, Dr. Paley read a paper questioning the usual translation of *ἀφ' ἡμῶν* in John xiv. 27, Mark xii. 19, Luke vii. 49, and Mr. Magnússon read a suggestive paper on misunderstood passages in the *Hávamál*—Elder Edda.

OBITUARY.

HENRI JORDAN.—In the *Wochenschrift für Klassische Philologie*, No. 1, 1877, Dr. E. Hübner gives an account of this distinguished scholar, who died on November 10th last at Königsberg, from the effects of an operation.

He was descended from an old family, belonging to the French colony in Berlin, where he was born September 30th, 1833. He studied partly at Bonn, attracted there by Ritschl, but principally at Berlin, and always regarded Moriz Haupt as his principal teacher. In 1867 he was appointed professor of classical philology at Königsberg. Hübner speaks warmly of the affection and respect with which he was regarded by his pupils and his friends.

His chief works were *Cato's Fragments*, Leipzig, 1860; *Scriptores historiae Augustae* (with Eyssenhardt), 1864; text of Sallust, 1866, 1876; the third edition, delayed by the discovery of new fragments, will shortly appear; *Forma urbis Romae*, 1874; *Topographie der Stadt Rom*, Berlin, Weidmann, vol. ii. 1871; vol. i. pt. 1, 1873; part 2, 1885; part 3 and a monograph on the forum remain unfinished; *Kritische Beiträge zur Geschichte der lat. Sprache*, Berlin, 1879. He also contributed largely to classical and archaeological journals, articles, some of them in Italian, on the religion, art, architecture, topography of Rome; on early Latin, and cognate dialects, not neglecting Greek authors, as Simonides of Amorgos, Theognis, Lysias.

Hübner hopes that these scattered articles, the work of one who has left deep traces on German scholarship, will be collected.

Jordan's specialty was the topography of Rome, and on that subject he was the first authority. But perhaps his critical edition of Sallust is the most familiar of his works to English students. In three or four articles in *Hermes* he determined the relative value of the more important MSS. in a way that has not been seriously questioned, and in the edition that followed he for the first time gave a trustworthy collation of them.

ERNEST DESJARDINS, born 30 September, 1823, died 22 October, 1886. In the *Revue Historique*, xii. (1887), pp. 101-105, Camille Jullian pays a short 'homage' to this eminent epigraphist and geographer. 'Sans entrer dans le détail de sa vie, dans ceux de ses dix missions en Italie et dans la péninsule des Balkans, dans l'analyse de ses travaux comme professeur, comme éditeur des œuvres de Borghesi, de la table de Peutinger, des *Addimenta au Corpus*, de la géographie administrative et politique de la Gaule romaine, comme membre de l'Institut, nous avons simplement voulu marquer les services qu'il a rendus à la science et à ses élèves. Nous aurions voulu qu'il nous fût possible aussi de faire connaître l'homme, son esprit, sa bonne grace, sa bonté. Tous ses élèves en conserveront l'ineffaçable souvenir.'

GEORGE HENRY HESLOP, who died on the 30th of January, at Oakley Rectory, Basingstoke, was born

in 1822 at or near Keswick, where his family had been settled for several generations. Soon after his birth his father was presented to the living of Great Musgrave in Westmorland, and he was sent to Appleby Grammar School, from which he proceeded to Sedbergh.

Here he was contemporary with the late W. M. Gunson of Christ's College, like himself a Cumberland man, and an intimacy was formed between them which developed into a friendship only to be broken by the sad death of Mr. Gunson a few years ago.

From Sedbergh Mr. Heslop entered Queen's College, Oxford as a tabarder on the old foundation, and was speedily recognized as a scholar of unusual promise by his private tutor, Mr. W. Linwood. His examination in the schools which gained him a place in the first class of 1846 was remarkably brilliant, and brought him at once into prominent notice. For a while he was assistant master at Rossall, and after this he resided as fellow and tutor of Queen's. Then he married, and accepted the small college living of Knights Enham, from which he moved in 1854 to the head-mastership of St. Bees. Here he remained for twenty-five years, working with great success upon the somewhat unpromising material that the free foundation brought to his hand. In 1879 he was left a widower. A new scheme for the management of the school was just about to come into operation, and Canon Heslop—for he had been appointed Hon. Canon of Carlisle in 1875—resigned the head-mastership to take up the living of Church Oakley which was offered him by his old college.

Beyond some anonymous theological essays and papers in magazines put forth at Oxford, his published works are but two, the well-known editions of the *Olynthiac* and *Philippic Orations* and of the *de Falsa Legatione* in the Catena Classicorum Series. But he was an indefatigable worker. In middle age he taught himself German for the sake of gaining access to the stores of scholarship laid up in that language, and he read and annotated and translated his favourite authors again and again. Much of this work was done with a view to eventual publication, but he could not bring himself to put forth to the world anything that seemed to himself imperfect. His keen critical faculty and his fastidious taste were mercilessly exercised on his own writings, and repeated revisions failed to bring with them that sense of perfection without which he would not publish.

He has left much manuscript, and among it there is a corrected and enlarged edition of his *Demosthenes*, virtually a new book, which is almost ready for the press. This, it is hoped, together with some translations and notes on various portions of different authors may before long be brought out by his son, a former scholar of Christ's College. It would indeed be a pity if the learning accumulated by so exact and fine a judgment and so retentive a memory should die with him, and leave but two little books behind to mark the place he held in the estimation of classical scholars.

REPORTS.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

THE Classical Departments of the British Museum are, as most of us are probably aware, endowed annually by our art-loving Treasury with a modest allowance for the purchase of antiquities; and by the munificence of private benefactors the sum of the annual acquisitions usually represents a considerable accession of interesting and valuable objects. But few are probably acquainted with the details of these acquisitions. A report is drawn up, it is true, each year, and presented towards June to the House of Commons, whence it is issued in the form of a Parliamentary Blue Book: thus many of the new treasures must in any case remain practically unknown for at least a year or more. As moreover this form of literature is not of such absorbing interest as to command a wide circulation, something further appears to be required to keep the public informed of their possessions. In this respect even Germany is better off than ourselves; for the *Archäologische Zeitung* has for several years past given a *compte rendu* of the British additions side by side with those of the Berlin Museum: this, however, is at best but a dry extract from a dry report. What is wanted seems to be a full monthly statement of acquisitions, and for this purpose I propose to avail myself of the monthly issue of the *Classical Review* to keep subscribers *au courant* with the antiquities of the National Collection, and, wherever possible, with the important additions to the principal local museums.

As a first instalment a report is herewith given which embraces the whole of the accessions of the past year. It is a melancholy fact that the grant for purchases has of late been steadily decreasing in inverse ratio to the growing difficulty experienced in obtaining works of Greek and Roman art from abroad. Not only is the export of antiquities everywhere either jealously restricted or absolutely forbidden, but English excavators, except in one or two isolated instances, can no longer obtain even reasonable terms on which to conduct scientific research.

Even where we have the opportunity of digging on our own soil, our impecunious condition is a hopeless bar. The instance of Cyprus is the most striking case in point. Ever since the British occupation of that

island, application has been made again and again to the Treasury for a grant to excavate, but all to no purpose. In 1881 a small private subscription was placed at Mr. Newton's disposal, which enabled him to procure an important representative collection of Cypriote pottery, but with this small exception nothing was for a long time done. We neither dug ourselves nor permitted others to dig. At length in despair at this dog-in-the-manger policy the local government arranged to issue permits to private individuals to dig under certain conditions, and from that time till now the ancient sites have been scratched at by all kinds of speculators with whom scientific results were as a general rule neglected in favour of commercial considerations.¹ It is true that in most cases the pottery of Cyprus does not present much variety, and the collection already in the British Museum is fairly representative; but every now and again a good thing turns up which has to be bought at an advanced price from the finder, unless, indeed, he can obtain a still longer price from the foreign museums, to which it is of course with lamentable impartiality offered.

This question has a peculiar interest for us just at the present; for the first time a site has been discovered, at Poli-tis-Chrysokhou, which has given results belonging to, and worthy of, the best period of Greek art. There are now in the British Museum, three objects from this site which are each of them in their way gems of the first water; the one is a silver ring on which in place of bezel a golden fly has alighted: a fly of such wonderful truth to nature, and yet such cunning skill, that even that prince of goldsmiths, Signor Giuliano, to whom I showed it, pronounces it a marvel of his art. With this comes a charming little *alabastron*, an exact terra-cotta imitation of the alabaster ointment vases from which it takes its name, decorated with two wild Maenads in polychrome colours on a white ground, and signed by (P)asiades. This

¹ It is only fair to say that the excavations recently conducted in Cyprus on behalf of the German Institute by Herr Duemmler, of which a valuable account is given in the *Mittheilungen* xi. pp. 209—262, are a signal exception to this rule. Herr Richter too, in his various speculative operations has often contrived to harmonize the interests of science with those of his numerous employers.

artist's name was not hitherto known; he must have lived nearly contemporary with the great painter Polygnotos, and his style is a charming combination of archaic freshness with refined skill. If this restoration of his name, which seems justified by the traces of the letters, is correct, it is worthy of remark that an Athenian vase published in Benndorf, *Gr. und sicil. Vasen*, taf. v. 5, gives us a painter's name Paseias, who may very likely have been one of the same family.¹

The third object from this find is a *lekythos* of great beauty decorated with red figures with white and gilt accessories on a fine black glaze; it belongs to a series of which the best, including this example, would belong to the first half of the fourth century, B.C. But the chief interest is in the design, which represents Oidipous slaying the Sphinx with a spear, in the presence of Athenè and other figures; a treatment of the myth which Greek literature had given us reason to expect, but of which this is the first representation in art that has yet come down to us. The figure of Athenè has a special interest here, in that it reproduces the exact type (only excepting the Nikè in the hand) of the chryselephantine statue of Pheidias; and to heighten the resemblance, the helmet, aegis, shield, spear, and bracelets have been gilt, while the entire figure and drapery are painted white. A seated figure of Apollo balances that of Athenè, and the remaining space is filled with the figures of Kastor and Polydeukes on one side and of Aineias on the other, all the figures being identified by their names inscribed beside them.

A brief description such as this cannot of course give anything like an adequate idea of the merit of these gems of art, any one of which ought to be sufficient to stimulate public enterprise towards a satisfactory and thorough excavation of this promising site.

Our pecuniary incapacity represents the dark side of the present condition of British archaeology; but fortunately we may congratulate ourselves that the outlook is not all gloomy. The tendency is certainly growing among us to place classical archaeology in its true position of importance wherever an interest is felt in classical literature and the art of all periods. There

are not wanting plenty of signs which point to a distinctly hopeful future. The new school at Athens, which has at length raised Britain to the same footing there with France, Germany, and America, and which is now commencing its work, will give impetus and encouragement to British enterprise. From the days of Dodwell and Leake down to the present times of Bent and Paton, whose patriotic generosity is so handsomely evidenced in the accompanying list of acquisitions, this quality has never been wanting in Englishmen, but the present movement will supply, it is thought, facilities which could never be obtained by private individuals, and will minimise the trouble and friction often entailed in desultory undertakings. The *Classical Review* will, it is hoped, furnish an opportunity for recording the notes and news of British students at Athens, for which its monthly issue is well adapted.

Coming now nearer home, we shall find the prospect equally encouraging. Archaeology is not only occupying a recognised position in the curriculum of our universities, but is being largely taken up in the most important of our public schools. Several have already the nucleus of a representative museum, others are contemplating the formation of one; and Mr. Upcott's little handbook of Greek sculpture, which we hope to notice in our next number, is a proof that the interest, at Marlborough at any rate, is not wholly that of curiosity.

This is all as it should be; perhaps when English scholarship shall finally have removed from itself the reproach of dilettantism, we may hope for its obtaining a more practical recognition from the State than has been its fortune hitherto.

ACQUISITIONS TO BRITISH MUSEUM, 1886.

NAUKRATIS COLLECTION.—A series from the antiquities excavated by Mr. Flinders Petrie during the winter of 1884-5 at Tell Nebirch, the site of the ancient Naukratis, and published in *Naukratis*, pt. i. 1884-5. *Third Memoir of the Egypt Exploration Fund*.

Architecture.

1. Limestone fragments from the archaic temple of Apollo, including part of what appears to be the necking of a column ornamented with a lotus pattern in low relief; parts of bead and reel and egg and tongue mouldings, with remains of colour; part of base of a column; part of drum of a column, diam. 1 ft. 6 in. with 25 shallow flutings; *Naukratis*, pt. iii.

2. Marble fragments from the second temple of Apollo, including bead and reel and anthemion patterns, with remains of red and blue colour; *ibid.* pls. xiv. xiv.a.

¹ See Klein, *Vasen mit Meistersignaturen*, new ed. 1887, p. 49. On p. 222 *ibid.* he gives a description of this *alabastron* under the name Iasiades. This does not sound a very likely name, and there seem besides to be actual traces of the Γ on the vase: unfortunately a fracture in the clay occurs just at this doubtful spot.

Greek Inscriptions.

3. Fragment of limestone slab, inscribed in archaic characters, Τεῶν ἐνὶ σῆμα; *ibid.* pl. xxx. 1.

4. Marble block inscribed with dedication of palaestra to Apollo by Kleainetos and Maiandrios; *ibid.* pl. xxx. 4.

5. Marble block inscribed with dedication, probably of a ram, to Zeus Thebaïos (Ammon), by Ampelion; *ibid.* pl. xxx. 2.

6. Limestone slab, with ten lines of elegiac inscription of sepulchral import and late period; *ibid.* pl. xxxi. 11.

Fictile Vases.

A series of fragments of pottery representing almost every stage of Greek vase-painting.

7. Among the archaic specimens are many engraved with dedications to Apollo, beside whose temple they were found, such as Φάνης με ἀνέθηκε τῷπόλλων[ι τῷ Μι]λησίῳ δ' Γλαύρο, on the rim of a large krater; this may refer to the Phanês whose story is narrated by Herodotus iii. 4; *ibid.* pl. xxxiii. 218.

Among the vases with designs, the following may be noted:—

8. A series of fragments of a ware hitherto unknown, painted in brown or orange on a creamy-white ground; *ibid.* pl. v.

9. Kylix of so-called Kyrenè style; *ibid.* pls. viii.-ix.

10. Kylix, black-figured, on each side, Ulysses tied beneath the ram.

Miscellaneous.

11. Terra-cotta figures, masks, and moulds for figures, moulds for scarabs, &c.

12. Several figures, fragments of vases, and scarabs, of porcelain.

13. Statuettes and fragments, of alabaster.

14. Statuettes of calcareous stone¹; among them, a nude figure of Aphrodite of finest Ptolemaic work, with ornaments in red; *ibid.* pls. i.-ii. p. 33.

15. Three fragments of the shell *tridakna squamosa*, engraved with lotus and Assyrian sacred tree; *ibid.* pl. xx.

16. Gold bandeau with *repoussé* figures of Hygieia, Ceres, Juno, and a medallion head of Helios; inscribed in late Greek characters with name Tiberius Claudius Artemidorus; *ibid.* pl. xxvii.

17. Gold and silver figures and ornaments; *ibid.* pls. xxvii.-xxviii.

ANTIQUITIES obtained by Mr. and Mrs. J. Theodore

¹ In *Mittheil.* xi. p. 36, Duenmiller refers to marble idols in the British Museum found at Naukratis and similar to those from Amorgos and other pre-Greek sites; but no such objects, nor indeed anything of so early a date, were found there.

(To be continued.)

Bent IN THE ISLAND OF KARPATOS; see *Hellenic Journal*, vol. vi. p. 235.

1. A very rude idol of dark limestone, 26 in. high, representing a female figure of which the arms and legs are not indicated; the nose and breasts are roughly chiselled out, and the style is clearly that of the prehistoric marble idols frequently found in the Greek islands. Acquired at Pegadia (ancient Poseidonia) where, as Mr. Bent says, 'there are evident traces of prehistoric remains.'

A series of objects excavated by Mr. and Mrs. Bent at Bourgounte (ancient Brykountios) on the extreme north of Karpathos; most from rock-cut tombs used by successive generations.

2. Large drab lebes, with two vertical and two horizontal handles, containing (3) a mastos of late greyish glaze, studded with oblique bands of pyramidal projections.

4 and 5. Two large rooftiles (*imbrices*) of a form new to me, viz. a nearly complete cylinder, which thins gradually to one end, where it terminates in a circular knob, from which again projects a spout. Drab with black decorations of ivy tendrils, rude birds, and florid palmette; probably, like a similar class of ware at Rhodes (Furtwaengler in *Jahrbuch*, 1886, p. 152), a late local imitation of a more archaic style. Both found in same tomb.

6. Similar in style to the preceding is an amphora with upright handles and a cover (lost), decorated round the body and neck with an ivy wreath; found in a tomb with the following vases, viz. 7. A trefoil oinochoë with late red figures, three ephebi. 13. A plain black glazed kantharos. 14. A ditto patera with graffito ΚΑΕ. 15. A lekythos with late red figure of a crouching panther.

The remaining vases are of the usual late Graeco-Roman black and drab ware, including some of the white-faced ware with polychrome decorations such as was found *e.g.* at Kyrenè. A date for much of this class of objects is afforded by the case of a series acquired by the British Museum in 1859, all found together in a tomb in Karpathos. This tomb contained a large lebes precisely similar to No. 2, two oinochoë of the thin-necked angular shape (common at Kyrenè), some late glass, common Roman jewellery and three bronze coins of Antoninus Pius, Faustina, and Caracalla respectively.

(The remainder of this Report, including General Acquisitions, Reports of British, Roman, and Coin Departments, will appear in the next issue in April.)

CECIL SMITH.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Mnemosyne. Nova series. xv pt. 1. Lugd. Bat. Brill. (Cobet, who contributed little or nothing to the last few numbers, has withdrawn from the editorship, which has been undertaken by S. A. Naber, J. van Leeuwen, jr. (to whom contributions are to be sent) and I. M. J. Valetton).

Quaestiones Graecae, I. De suffragio senum milium Atheniensi, ser. I. M. J. Valetton. pp. 1-47.—*Plat. Theat.* p. 151a. J. v. Leeuwen reads συγκομίσαι for συγχωρήσαι, coll. p. 149e συγκομιδὴν (and—ῆς).—*Notulae criticae ad Pausaniam*, ser. II. v. Herwerden. pp. 48-74. Many certain emendations *e.g.* iv 16 7 (and v 26 9) ἐπίσημα for ἐπίθημα. In the oracle viii

42 5 for ἐλκεσισταχύων (which should be ἐλκεσιστ. or ἐλξιστ.), ἐκ δεσισταχύων, retaining ναστοφάγων. In vii 17 3 he retains Buttmann's αἶον for εὐθύ; in x 32 2 'sine controversia e Porsoni correctione edendum fuerat καὶ ῥάων εὐζώιφ ἀνδρὶ <ῆ> ἡμίονοις τε καὶ ἵπποις ἐπὶ τὸ ἄντρον ἐστὶν ἀνοδος τὸ Κωρύκιον.'—*Homericæ*, ser. J. v. Leeuwen. pp. 75-119. 'De particularum κέν et ἄν apud Homerum usu.' The former (1230 exx. in Il. and Od.) is alone Homeric; the latter (280 exx. with 80 of ἦν and ἐπήν) is to be corrected in all genuine passages. Only eleven exx. of ἄν are for the present left uncorrected. One of the restorations is due to Oxford. 'Commemoranda est

elegantissima correctio, qua doctus Anglus Monro, de Homericæ syntaxi bene meritis, persanavit versum M 41 :

ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἂν ἔν τε κύνεσσι καὶ ἀνδράσι θηρητῆρσι
κάπριος ἢ ἐλέων στρέφεται.

'Vides ἄν cum præsentī indicatīvi iungi, et sine ullo igitur dubio vitiosum esse. Restituit Monro poetæ manum scribendo (*Hom. Synt.* p. 51) :

ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἔναντα κύνεσσι.—

Aristoph. *Nub.* 1065 by the same. For πλεῖν ἢ τάλαντα πολλά read πλεῖν ἢ ἑκατὸν τάλαντα, i.e. ΠΛΕΙΝ Η Η ΤΑΛΑΝΤΑ, when the second ἢ (= ἑκατόν) had fallen out, a scribe added πολλά for the metre. See Lys. 19 45 seq. ὥστ' ἄντο εἶναι τινες αὐτῶ (to Alcibiades) πλεῖν ἢ ἑκατὸν τάλαντα and Ael. v. h. x 17.—*Serviana*, ser. J. van der Niet. (Six corrections of Serv. Aen III).—I. N. Madvigius, ser. C. M. Francken. A graceful tribute, which considerations of space alone prevent us from transcribing. We extract from it the following letter written by Madvig, Aug. 1884 in answer to congratulations on his eightieth birthday. 'Ex laudibus, quibus me epistola tua onerat, ceteras nimias esse et benevolentia exaggeratas intelligo sentioque, unam agnosco accipioque, quod indefessum litteras nostras tuendi iuvandique studium mihi tribuis, nec felicitatis prædicationem, nisi impius sim, repudiare liceat, quod mihi et longum operæ navandæ spatium natura deusque concessit nec vires senectus etiam longe provecta prorsus subtraxerit. Sed tamen a philologia me sensim et oculi prope novem iam annos sic caligantes, ut et in legendo et in scribendo alieno auxilio utar, remouent et animus vitam ætam respiciens et, quod instat adventatque, prospiciens ad alia meditanda avocat. Itaque studiorum communium, quæ amare non desinam, tutelam et amplificationem vobis, qui me æqualesque meos antiquitatis humanitatisque amore æquatis, viribus et ætatis robore superatis, trado commendoque tuisque propriis laboribus lætum successum precor, sive tu Lucilium ceterosque scriptores Latinos sive Latinorum instituta tractare perges.'

Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift, edited by C. BELGER and O. SEYFFERT. No. 1 (1 Jan. 1887) Reviews.—A. Kiessling, Horace's *Satires* (W. Mewes). 'Decidedly the best edition of the *Satires* yet published.'—K. Sittl, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur bis auf Alexander den Grossen*. Zweiter Teil. (E. Heitz). 'Spoilt by hurried work.'—A. v. Urbanitzky, *Elektrizität u. Magnetismus im Altertum* (S. Günther). 'A successful book.'

No. 2 (8 Jan.) A. Gemell, *Die homerischen Hymnen* (A. D. Ludwig; continued from No. 1). 'More cautious than the recent edition of Abel, but defective in many points.'—Lorenz, *Miles Gloriosus* (E. A. Sonnenschein), notes in detail on several passages.—A. Terquem, *La science romaine à l'époque d'Auguste* (S. Günther). 'The real aim of the book is to answer the question what, apart from the subjects directly treated of, can be learnt from Vitruvius as to the history of other sciences; much to be learnt from the book though it is hardly up to the German standard.'—S. Reinach, *Conseils aux voyageurs archéologues en Grèce et dans l'Orient hellénique*, 'a charming little book.'

No. 3 (15 Jan.) H. Gührner, *Musikgeschichtliches aus Homer* (H. Riemann). 'a stimulating, but too positive, study.'—P. Wendland, *Quæstiones Musoniæ. De Musonio Stoico, Clementis Alexandri aliorumque auctore*. (L. Stein); 'much to be recommended.'—G. Billinger, *Die Zeitmesser der Antiken Völker* (S. Günther); 'good.'—K. Ohlert, *Rätsel u. Gesellschaftsspiele der alten Griechen* (G.

Knaack); 'good'—C. Rhomaïdes, *Τὰ μουσεῖα τῶν Ἀθηνῶν*, en reproduction phototypique. I Lieferung, Fouilles de l'Acropole, texte descriptif de P. Cavvadias (C. Belger). Reviewer traces the changes in costume and arrangement of the hair.

No. 4 (22 Jan.) U. v. Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, *Isyllus von Epidauros* (G. Schultz). 'A work of art and of genius: the author puts forth revolutionary views on metre.'—E. Schweder, *Ueber die Weltkarte des Kosmographen von Ravenna; Versuch einer Rekonstruktion der Karte*. (D. Detlefsen); 'not altogether a success.'—H. Jordan, *Analecta epigraphica Latina* (Chambalu) a discussion of three inscriptions.

No. 5 (29 Jan.) E. Brey, *De septem fabulæ stasimo altero* (Wecklein); contains a good explanation of ὠκύποινον in l. 729,—E. Bruhn, *Lucubrationum Euripidearum capita selecta* (Wecklein), 'methodical and clever textual criticism; in the last chapter a discussion of the date of Soph. *Electra*,—M. Petschenig, *F. C. Corippi Africani Grammatici quæ supersunt* (J. Partsch) 'an excellent work, particularly strong in questions of late Latin style.'—H. Nohl, *M. T. Ciceronis orationes selectæ*, vol. 3 de imp. Pomp. in L. Catilinam (J. H. Schmalz) 'good'—Original Article: J. Baunack, *Cretica* (continued from preceding four numbers) *linguistic* consideration of some inscriptions from Crete.

No. 6 (5 Feb.) F. J. Schwerdt, *Methodologische Beiträge zur Wiederherstellung der griechischen Tragiker* (Wecklein) mainly concerned with the choruses of the *Agamemnon*—'an accomplished writer, but the book contains little of value.'—G. Hart, *zur Seelen u. Erkenntnislehre des Demokrit* (F. Lortzing). Reviewer does not agree with the results—Strecker, *Ueber den Rückzug der Zehntausend* (C. Belger). 'The author is a general in the Ottoman service who has travelled much in Armenia. His theories did not recommend themselves to Kiepert, but the little book is to be warmly recommended. It contains a large and excellent map.'—C. Meissner, *M. T. Ciceronis Somnium Scipionis* (F. Müller). 'An excellent school edition, especially on questions of style.'—E. Thomas, *Ciceronis in Verrem IV de signis* (J. H. Schmalz) 'an excellent school edition'—E. Krah, *Beiträge zur Syntax des Curtius*, Teil I. (J. H. Schmalz) 'treats of the cases, very useful'—C. Diehl, *Ravenna. Etudes d'archéologie byzantine* (G. D.) 'aims and successfully at summarizing results.'—B. Deipser, *Ueber die Bildung u. Bedeutung der lateinischen Adjectiva auf fer u. ger* (K. E. Georges), a detailed and complimentary review.

Original articles by A. Bötticher and C. Belger on the Excavations at the Acropolis of Athens (continued from the five previous numbers).

Rheinisches Museum, vol. xlii. Part. 1.

'Leukippos und Diogenes von Apollonia,' by H. Diels. An answer to Natorp's paper in vol. xli. p. 349. 'Neue Briefe von Julianus Apostata,' by A. Papadopoulos Kerameus, who re-edits with notes six letters discovered by him at Chalki. 'Ueber Tempel-Orientirung, V.' by H. Nissen. Continued from vol. xl. p. 370. 'Sealiger's und Labbé's handschriftliche Noten zu den veteres glossæ verborum iuris,' by Ingram Bywater. The marginal notes from the original volume, late in the possession of Mark Pattison. 'Die Entwicklung der Ueberlieferung über die Lykurgischen Verfassung II. and III.' by Ed. Meyer. II. is on the *ῥήτραι*, which he considers unauthentic. III. argues that Lyeurgus was originally the same as Zeus Lycaeus. 'Zur Ueberlieferung der Politik des Aristoteles,' by S. Heylbut. A collation of certain passages found in the

Vatican Aristides-codex. 'Die verloren gegangenen Scenen der Plautinischen Bacchides,' by O. Ribbeck. 'Das Wiener Apion Fragment,' by A. Kopp. 'Die Gladiatorentessen,' by P. J. Meier. Chiefly on the import of the words 'spectatus,' 'palus,' and 'rudis.'

Under the head of Miscellen:—Nonnana, by H. Tiedke. Athenaeus, iv. p. 174. F. Dümmler. Reads *Ξενοφάνης* for *Ξενοφών* and restores the lines. Diog. Laert. I. 79, und die Chronologie des Pittakos. F. Susemihl. Quintilian, x. 1, 46. E. Wölfflin. Reads 'luminum' for 'annium.' Quintilian, x. 1, 79. F. Beecher. Removes comma after 'studiosus' and places it after 'compositione.' Apulei Metamorphoses. Joh. van der Vliet. 'Ist Herodot's Geschichte vollendet?' E. Meyer. Decides in the affirmative in spite of vii. 213. Verschleppte griechische Inschriften. K. Schumacher. Ala classiana in Köln, by 'F. B.' A tomb-inscription found at Cologne proving the ala classiana to have been stationed there, probably to cooperate with the fleet. Nachtrag zu, vol. xli. p. 640. A. Riese.

Zeitschrift für das Gymnasial-wesen herausg. G. von H. KERN und H. J. MÜLLER. Berlin. Jan. 1887.

THE only articles which call for mention here are, (1) On the 'History of the Roman Empire in Higher Education,' by Dr. H. Schiller, pp. 8-21, in which he insists on the importance of this study in the upper forms of schools of higher education, and suggests improvements in the methods of teaching it, by paying less attention to proper names and more to the growth of institutions. (2) Two *Jahresberichte des philologischen Vereins zu Berlin*, the former a report by H. J. Müller, editor of Weissenborn's Livy, on the literature of Livy during 1885 and 1886 (pp. 1-30), the latter by G. Andresen (pp. 31-48 incomplete), on Tacitus during 1884 and 1885. Besides the 3rd ed. of Weissenborn (Bks vi-viii), and the 4th of Madvig and Ussing which has been revised by Siesbye and Zachariä (Bks xxi-xxv), Luterbacher's school edition of Bks iii and iv with explanatory notes is praised. Two books of criticism are commended, *Quaestiones criticae et palaeographicae de relictis codicibus Livianis* by W. Heraeus, and *Prolegomena in T. Livii librum xxxiii* by A. Frigele. The reviewer notices only one English book (L. D. Dowdall, Bk xxi) which he pronounces to be merely a compilation, and one French by L. Duvau, giving an account of a new MS. of the 1st decad, which he considers to be of no importance. He also gives the names of nine English books, four French, three Italian, two Hungarian, two Russian, which he has not seen. Andresen notices seven German books on Tacitus, and names two French and one Italian. He speaks of K. Heräus' 4th ed. of Hist. i ii, and 3rd ed. of iii-v as having been considerably improved.

The *Philologus*, vol. xlv., part 1, contains:—

1. 'Duo commentarii de comoedia,' by G. Studemund, giving the Greek text with the readings of five MSS. and parallel extracts from Valla. 2. Pseudo-Plutarchus de Metro Heroico. G. Studemund. Edited from codex C. Parisiis. 3. Das Prooemium der Odyssee, und der Anfang des fünften Buches, by A. Scotland, proposing to cut them down as follows: i. 1-14, 11-14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 26; v. 4, 28-31, 43, with some changes in the reading. 4. Beiträge zu Sophocles Oedipus Rex. A. Spengel. 1. 198 reads *τελεῖ*, 287, puts colon at *τοῦτ'*, 328 f. supplies *ἔσται* with *οὐ μή ποτε* and takes *ὥς* = *ὅπως*, 597-600, *ἐνταῦθ'* = *ἐμοί, νοῦς* sc. *ἐμός* and *κακός* is predicative, 1221 f. the reference is to the deliverance from the plague, 1512 f. reads *εὔχεσθ'* *ἐμοί οὐ καιρὸς ἦ...* and construes *εὔχεσθε* actively, 1526 reads *ᾧ τίς...* for

ὅστις and supplies *ἦν* with *ἐπιβλέπων*. 5. *τίς* and *ὅστις* in pronominal Wiederholungsfragen bei Aristophanes. W. Uckermann. 'The direct, as well as the indirect, interrogative pronoun or pronom. advb. may be used in repeating a question.' 6. Zum Monumentum Ancyranum III. J. Schmidt. The continuation of a critical review of the edition by Wölfflin and Wilamowitz. 7. Laeviana. C. Haeblerlin. Collecting the references to this little-known poet. 8. Ueber die römische Aedilität in ältester Zeit. Ed. Moll. A review and comparison of the works of Soltau, Herzog, and Ohnescit, on the subject.

Notes on the following also appear:—

Tac. dial. de Or. cap 10. (Th. Stangl.) Read 'transisse' for 'transit et.' Minucius Felix Octavius. (A. Eussner.) Theophrastus Char. 29. (G. F. Ungar.) Callimachus, Hym. Del. l. 10. (C. Haeblerlin.) Read '*Κάρναι αἰνέσης*.' Aristotle, Psychol. (Fr. Susemihl.) Ammianus Marcellinus, xxvi. 6, 15. (Th. Stangl.) Read 'cavationem' for 'cavillationem' and perhaps 'infimam' for 'miciam.' Rhet. Lat. ed. Halm, p. 65. Carmen de figuris, 41 ff. (A. Eussner.) Read 'fama' for 'famam.' Aristophan. Acharn. 1095. (C. Haeblerlin.) Read

σὺ δ' ἐγκόνηι· δείπνόν τις εὖ σκευάζετω.

Under 'Jahresberichte' comes the first part of a paper by H. Landwehr on the researches made in Greek history between 1882 and 1886.

Under 'Miscellen' appear the following:—

1. A contribution to Latin epigraphy, by Joh. Schmidt, on 'cupula,' arguing that in certain African inser. the word occurs and signifies a tombstone of peculiar form. 2. On Sophocles Electra, by E. Deiter, commenting on ll. 157 f., 466 f., 757 f., 986 f. 3. On the quotation from Polybius in Julius Africanus, ap. Eusebius, Praep. evang. x. 10, 3, by G. F. Unger, who thinks *Πολυίστορος* should be substituted for *Πολυβίου*. 4. On the Periplus of the Pseudo-Scylax, by Wiedemann. 'That the Egyptian information is drawn from Hecataeus and not from Hdt., and that it represents Hecataeus more faithfully than Hdt. does; as no personal observation is used to correct him.' 5. Critical notes on Cicero's philosophical works. H. Deiter. 6. The position of March 1st in the old Latin solar year, by L. Holzapfel, who places it on Feb. 24th. A summary of periodicals completes the number.

The *Philol. Anzeiger* for Jan. 6th contains reviews of the following:—

1. Hübner, Römische Epigraphik in Iwan Müller's Handbuch, by Joh. Schmidt, favourable, but contesting many points. 2. Miller, De decretis Atticis, Quaestiones Epigraphicae. 'Disputes Hartel's position, and establishes his own after a careful examination of the material.' 3. Allbracht, Kampf und Kampfschilderung bei Homer. 'Confounds poetic and absolute truth; throws light on Homer, but not on primitive warfare.' 4. Hüttig, Zur Charakteristik Homerischer Composition. 5. Seeliger, Die Ueberlieferung der Griechischen Heldensage bei Stesichorus. 'From a narrow, but instructive, point of view.' 6. Ohlert, Räthsel und Gesellschaftsspiele der alten Griechen. 7. Christ, Platonische Studien. 'The Parmenides must have preceded the Sophistes.' 8. Kopp, Beiträge zur Griechischen Excerptenlitteratur, by O. Crusius, who refutes the charge of fictitiousness brought against Miller's Athous. 9. Below, De Hiato Plautino Quaestionum Prima Pars, qua agitur de hiato qui fit in thesi. 10. Plessis, Italici Ilias Latina. Very severely handled. 11. F. B. Jevons. The Development of the Athenian Democracy. Does not agree with the position taken up. 12, 13, 14, 15,

Bücheler und Zitelmann, Das Recht von Gortyn, Suppl. to Rh. Mus. vol. 40. The text by Bücheler, the subject-matter by Zitelmann; excellently treated. Lewy, Altes Stadtrecht von Gortyn auf Kreta. 'Handy and clear.' J. und T. Baunach, Die Inschrift von Gortyn. 'With a careful and valuable commentary, mainly philological.' J. Simon, Zur Inschrift von Gortyn. 'Careless and faulty.' 16. Liebenam, Beiträge zur Verwaltungsgeschichte des Römischen Kaiserreichs, I. Die Laufbahn der Procuratoren, bis auf die Zeit Diocletians. 17. Schweder, Ueber die Weltkarte des Kosmographen von Ravenna, Versuch einer Rekonstruktion der Karte. 'The world as a circle with Jerusalem as the centre, divided into 24 hours by lines through Ravenna.'

It further contains a list of publications, miscellaneous notes, and an index to the philological articles in periodicals for 1886.

The Journal of Philology. No. XXX. Macmillan. Svo. 4s. 6d.

ON AURELIUS VICTOR. By F. Haverfield.—Aristotle, Politics III 2 2 (Congreve); 1275b, 16. By Wm. Ridgeway.—Notes on Plautus, Mercator, Prol. 54, and III 1 26 (524). By J. H. Onions.—Placidiana (ed. Denerling). By J. H. Onions.—'ΑΠΡΑΤΟΣ—'ΑΠΡΑΚΤΟΣ Pionii vita Polycarpi 8 (Lightfoot's *Ignatius and Polycarp*, II 1021, 39). By John E. B. Mayor.—Suetonius Augustus, 92. By John E. B. Mayor.—'Η'ΕΝΕΡΓΟΤΣΑ in Heliodorus. By John E. B. Mayor.—Eunapius Vit. Soph. pp. 177, 35 and 480, 14. Didot. By John E. B. Mayor.—Seneca de Beneficiis VI 16, § 2 Medicus Amicus, Medicus Imperator. By John E. B. Mayor.—Olem. Al. Strom. IV § 62, p. 592 Potter. By John E. B.

Mayor.—Dierectus. By H. Nettleship.—The Study of Latin Grammar among the Romans in the First Century. By H. Nettleship.—Herodotus in Egypt. By D. D. Heath.—Notes on a Fortnight's Research in the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris. By Robinson Ellis.—On the Trilogy and Tetralogy in the Greek Drama. By A. E. Haigh.—Plato's later Theory of Ideas. VI. The Politicus. By Henry Jackson.—William Hepworth Thompson. By C. Merivale.

Expositor, Jan. 1887. In a very interesting paper which is continued in the Feb. number, Prof. Sanday states and examines three theories which he connects with the names of Bishop Lightfoot, Dr. Hatch, and Dr. A. Harnack, upon the origin of the Christian Ministry. Other articles are on Prof. Westcott as a theologian, by the Rev. W. H. Simcox, on the prophetess Deborah, by Prof. A. B. Davidson, on Difficult Texts of the Old Testament, by Prof. Driver. Prof. Cheyne gives brief laudatory notices of Kuehnen's *Introduction to the Hexateuch* and Dr. C. A. Briggs' on *Messianic Prophecy*.

In the Feb. number Prof. Westcott writes on Some Lessons from the Revised Version of the New Testament; Prof. J. A. Beet defends the literal meaning of ἀπαραμύς in Phil. ii. 6, translating 'deemed not his being equal to God a means of (perhaps rather 'ground for') grasping earthly good for himself.' Dr. Godet writes on the ep. to Philemon. There are also brief notices by Dr. Marcus Dodds of *Old Biblical Texts* no. ii, Weymouth's *Resultant Greek Testament*, Rendel Harris' *Fragments of Philo Judaeus*, and the 2nd ed. of Salmon's *Introduction to the New Testament*, containing a new chapter on the non-canonical books.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS PUBLISHED FROM JANUARY 1 TO FEBRUARY 15, 1887.

This List will be issued regularly with each number, and an attempt will be made to include in it all works bearing on the study of Classical Antiquity *actually published* during the month. New editions will only be chronicled if there is a change either in matter or in price. New periodical publications will be registered on the appearance of the first Number, and a general list of all such as treat of Classical Studies will be given at the end of the year.

BOOKS PUBLISHED IN ENGLAND.

Aeschylus. The Seven against Thebes of Aeschylus, with an Introduction, Commentary and Translation by A. W. Verrall, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Svo. xl. 179 pp. London, Macmillan. 7s. 6d.

Caesar. The Gallic War. With Notes, Vocabulary, and Maps. 16mo. London, Rivingtons.

Book I. 48, 48 pp. Map. 1s.

Book II. 72, 37 pp. Map. 1s.

Cicero. Cato Major, de Senectute, edited with Notes by L. Huxley. 16mo. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 2s.

— Oratio Philippica Secunda, with Introduction and Notes by A. G. Peskett, M.A., Fellow of Magdalene College, Cambridge. 16mo. xxiv. 151 pp. Cambridge, Pitt Press. 3s. 6d.

Euripides. Andromache. Literally translated from the text of Paley by W. J. Hickie. 12mo. 38 pp. London, Cornish. 1s. 6d.

Herodotus (H.). Notes on Thucydides, Book I., compiled and original. 16mo. iv. 242 pp. London, Longmans. 2s. 6d.

Gretton (F. E., Head Master of Stamford Grammar School). Classical Coincidences. 12mo. 68 pp. London, Elliot Stock.

Head (B. V.) Historia Nummorum. A Manual of Greek Numismatics. Large Svo. lxxv. 807 pp. 5 plates. 399 woodcuts. Oxford, Clarendon Press. £2 2s.

Homer. Odyssey, Books I.—XII. Translated into English Verse by the Earl of Carnarvon. Post Svo. 300 pp. London, Macmillan. 7s. 6d.

Horace. The Eton Horace. Part I. The Odes and Epodes. With notes to the Odes. Book I. By F. W. Cornish, M.A., Assistant Master at Eton College. Crown Svo. London, Murray. 3s. 6d.

Jebb (R. C.) Homer: an Introduction to the Iliad and the Odyssey. 12mo. vi. 202 pp. Glasgow, MacLehose. 3s. 6d.

Juvenal. Thirteen Satires of Juvenal, edited with Introduction and Notes by C. H. Pearson, M.A., sometime Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford, and H. A. Strong, M.A., LL.D., Professor of Latin in Liverpool University College. 12mo. 147, 162 pp. Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Kennedy (B. H.) Latin Vocabulary. New edition, revised and enlarged. Post Svo. 154 pp. London, Longmans. 2s. 6d.

Mahaffy (J. P.) Alexander's Empire. Svo. xxii. 322 pp. With Maps and Illustrations. London, Fisher Unwin. 5s.

Mommsen (J.) The History of Rome from Caesar to Diocletian. Translated with the author's sanction and additions by W. P. Dickson. With maps. 2 vols. Svo. 720 pp. London, Bentley. £1 16s.

Nepos. Selections illustrative of Greek and Roman

- History, edited for the use of beginners, with Introduction, Notes, Exercises and Vocabulary by G. S. Farnell, M.A. 16mo. vi. 128 pp. London, Macmillan. 1s. 6d.
- Paley* (F. A.) The Gospel of St. John: a verbatim translation from the Vatican MS., with the notable Variations of the Sinaitic and Beza MS.; with brief Explanatory Comments. 8vo. 174 pp. London, Sonnenschein. 7s. 6d.
- Platonis* Apologia Socratis, with Introduction, Notes and Appendices by J. Adam, B.A., Fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge. 16mo. xxii. 39. 136 pp. Cambridge, Pitt Press. 3s. 6d.
- Apology of Socrates and Crito. With Notes, critical and exegetical, Introductory Notices and Logical Analysis by the late W. Wagner. New edition. 12mo. 114 pp. London, Bell. 2s. 6d.
- Thucydides*, Notes on, *see* Geare.
- Tibullus* and *Propertius*, Selections from, with Introduction and Notes by G. G. Ramsay, M.A., Professor of Latin in the University of Glasgow. 16mo. lix. 379 pp. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 6s.
- Upcott* (L. E.) An Introduction to Greek Sculpture. 12mo. xvi. 135 pp. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 4s. 6d.
- Zompolides* (D.) A Course of Modern Greek or the Greek Language of the Present Day. Part I. Elementary Method. 12mo. xxii. 179 pp. London, Williams and Norgate. 5s.

BOOKS PUBLISHED ON THE CONTINENT.

- Aristotle*. Supplementum Aristotelicum, Vol. II. pars I. Alexandri Aphrodisiensis praeter commentaria scripta minora de anima cum mantissa ed. Ivo Bruns. 8vo. xvii. 231 pp. Berlin. 9 Mk. (I. II. 1, 24 Mk.)
- Attinger* (G.) Beitrage zur Geschichte von Delos bis auf Ol. 153. 2. 8vo. 73 pp. Frauenfeld. 2 Mk.
- Augustini* (S. Aurelii) Operum sect. III. pars I. Liber qui appellatur speculum et liber de divinis scripturis sive speculum quod fertur S. Augustini. Rec. et comment. crit. instr. F. Wehrich. 8vo. lii. 725 pp. Vienna. 15 Mk.
- Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum, Vol. XII.
- Bachmann* (J.) Secundi Philosophi Taciturni vita ac sententiae secundum codicem aethiopicum Bero-linensem quem in linguam latinam vertit neenon introductione instruxit J. B. 8vo. 44 pp. Berlin. 1 Mk. 20.
- Bazin* (H.) L'Aphrodite marseillaise du Musée de Lyon, statue archaïque grecque orientale du VI^e siècle avant J.-C. 8vo. Plate and cuts. Paris. 3 fr.
- Beck* (H.) Lateinische Grammatik für höhere Lehranstalten, bearb. von W. Haag. 5th ed. 8vo. vi. 173 pp. Berlin. 1 Mk. 50.
- Lateinisches Übungsbuch für Gymnasien. Abtheilung für Quinta. 5th ed. iv. 108 pp. Berlin. 1 Mk.
- Benoist* (E.) Nouveau dictionnaire français-latin rédigé d'après les travaux les plus récents de la Lexicographie. 2nd ed. 32mo. iv. 788 pp. Paris. Cloth. 5 fr.
- Boissier* (G.) Promenades archéologiques. Rome et Pompéi. 3rd edition, revised and enlarged. 12mo. vi. 407 pp. 8 plans. Paris. 3 fr. 50.
- Brady* (Jno.) Die Lautveränderungen der neugriechischen Volkssprache und Dialekte nach ihrer Entwicklung aus dem Altgriechischen dargestellt. 8vo. 128 pp. Göttingen. 1 Mk. 50.
- Bruns* (C. G.) Fontes juris romani antiqui. Ed. V. cura Th. Mommsenii. II. 8vo. xvi. pp. 209-422. Freiburg. 4s. (Complete, 8s.)
- Büdingen* (M.) Der Patriciat und das Fehderecht in den letzten Jahrzehnten der römischen Republik. (*extr.* Denkschriften d. k. Akad. der Wiss.) 4to. 48 pp. Vienna. 2 Mk. 40.
- Burchard-Biedermann* (Th.) Helvetien unter den Römern. 4to. 36 pp. Basle. 1 Mk. 50.
- Cicero's* Ausgewählte Reden erklärt v. K. Hahn. Vol. IV. Die Rede für Publius Sestius. 6th edition, revised by G. Laubmann. 8vo. vi. 123 pp. Berlin. 1 Mk. 50.
- Collicux* (E.) Étude sur Dietys de Crète et Darès de Phrygie. 8vo. 111 pp. Grenoble.
- Cremmer* (H.) Bibl.-theol. Wörterbuch der neutestamentl. Gräcität. 5th enlarged and revised edition. Part I. Royal 8vo. 304 pp. Gotha. 5 Mk. 60.
- Cuq* (E.) Recherches historiques sur le Testament per aes et libram. 8vo. 55 pp. Paris. (*extr.* Nouvelle Revue historique du droit français).
- Curschmann* (F.) Horatiana. 8vo. iv. 71 pp. Berlin. 1 Mk. 60.
- Daremberg* (Ch.) et *Saglio* (E.) Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines. Part XI. (Cup-Del). Large 4to. Pp. 1601-1703 of Vol. I. Vol. II. Pp. 1-56. Cuts 2160-2295. Paris. 5 fr.
- Denis* (J.) La Comédie grecque. 2 vols. 8vo. 518, 556 pp. Paris. 15 fr.
- Eichert* (O.) Wörterbuch zu den Commentarien des Cajus Julius Cäsar, sowie zu den Schriftwerken seiner Fortsetzer. 9th edition, revised. 8vo. iii. 319 pp. Hannover. 1 Mk. 80.
- Eichler* (E.) De responsione Euripidea. Part I. 8vo. 68 pp. Leipzig. 1 Mk. 50.
- Engelhardt* (M.) Die lateinische Konjugation nach den Ergebnissen der Sprachvergleichung dargestellt. 8vo. viii. 140 pp. Berlin. 2 Mk. 40.
- Epictète*. Manuel. Texte grecque, avec introduction, notes et lexique de mots techniques par Ch. Thurot. 16mo. xxxvi. 75 pp. Paris. 1 fr.
- Franke* (K.) De nominum propriorum epithetis Homericis. 8vo. 60 pp. Greifswald. 1 Mk.
- Gasquy* (A.) Cicéron jurisconsulte, avec une table des principaux passages relatifs au droit contenus dans les œuvres de Cicéron. 8vo. 304 pp. Paris. 5 fr.
- Gebhardt* u. *Harnack*. Texte und Untersuchungen. iii. 1. 2. *See* Loofs.
- Gemoll* (A.) Die Scriptores historiae Augustae. I. 4to. 14 pp. Leipzig. 80 pf.
- Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft hrsg. von *Iwan Müller*. 5th section. (Vol. I. pp. xx. 619-713. Vol. IV. pp. 1-221). *Unger*: Zeitrechnung der Griechen und Römer. *Nissen*: Griechische und Römische Metrologie. *Busolt*: Die Griechischen Alterthümer I. Staats- und Rechtsaltertümer. 5 Mk. 50.
- Homer*. La Odisea traducida directamente del griego en verso castellano por D. F. Barraibar y Zummága. Vol. II.—La Batracomiomaquia traducida por D. Jen. Alenda. 8vo. Madrid. 5 pesetas.
- Odyssée: Chants 1, 2, 5, 18, 22, 24 publiés à l'usage de la classe de rhétorique par F. Lecluse. 12mo. iv. 112 pp. Paris. 1 fr.
- — — Chants 1, 2, 6, 11, 22, 23. Edition classique avec notice littéraire par E. Talbot. 16mo. xxiv. 100 pp. Paris. 1 fr.
- Homolle* (Th.) Les archives de l'intendance sacrée à Délos (315-166 av. J.-C.) 8vo. 132 pp. Paris. 5 fr.
- Bibl. des Ecoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome. Fasc. 49.
- Horatius*. Texte latin avec arguments, notes en français et précis sur les mètres, par E. Sommer. 16mo. xvi. 426 pp. Paris. 2 fr.

- Horatius*. Epistula ad Pisones de arte poetica. Publié avec une introduction, et des notes critiques et explicatives par M. Albert. 16mo. xii. 44 pp. Paris. 1 fr.
- Die Dichtkunst, ins Deutsche übersetzt von E. Schauenburg. 4to. 27 pp. Leipzig. 1 Mk.
- Episteln, deutsch von C. Bardt. 8vo. 121 pp. Bielefeld. 1 Mk. 60.
- Humbert* (G.) Essai sur les finances et la comptabilité publique chez les Romains. 2 vols. 8vo. Paris. 18 fr.
- Jung* (J.) Römer und Romanen in den Donauländern. 2nd edition. 8vo. viii. 372 pp. Innsbruck. 7 Mk. 60.
- Junghahn* (E. A.) Studien zu Thukydides. Neue Folge. (extr. Berliner Studien). 8vo. 96 pp. Berlin. 3 Mk. 60.
- Kanter* (H.) Platos Anschauungen über Gymnastik. 4to. 22 pp. Leipzig. 1 Mk.
- Klein* (W.) Die Griechischen Vasen mit Meister-signaturen. 2nd revised and enlarged edition. 8vo. viii. 261 pp. Vienna. 6 Mk.
- Krebs* (I. Ph.) Antibarbarus der lateinischen Sprache. Nebst einem kurzen Abriss der Geschichte der latein. Sprache und Vorbemerkungen über reine Latinität. Sechste Auflage in vollständiger Umarbeitung von J. H. Schmalz. Lfg. 4. 8vo. Pp. 401-528. Basel. 2 Mk.
- Kreyher* (Joh.) L. Annaeus Seneca und seine Beziehungen zum Urchristenthum. 8vo. viii. 198 pp. Berlin. 5 Mk.
- Lamparter* (G.) Noch einmal zu Platon's Phädon 62 A. 4to. 44 pp. Stuttgart. 75 pf.
- Leben des heiligen David von Thessalonike, griechisch nach der einzigen bisher aufgefundenen Handschrift hrsg. von V. Rose. 8vo. xvi. 22 pp. Berlin. 1 M.
- Loeschke* (G.) Boreas und Oreithyia am Kypseloskasten. 4to. 12 pp. Dorpat. 60 pf.
- Loofs* (F.) Leontius von Byzanz und die gleichnamigen Schriftsteller der griechischen Kirche. I.: Das Leben und die polem. Werke des Leontius von Byzanz. 8vo. viii. 317 pp. Leipzig. 10s.
- Vol. III. parts 1 and 2 of: Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der althechristlichen Literatur von O. von Gebhardt und A. Harnack.
- Menard* (L.) Histoire des Grecs avec de nombreuses illustrations d'après les Monuments. Cours de cinquième. 12mo. xxiv. 1032 pp. Paris. 6 fr.
- Mommsen* (Tycho). Beiträge zu der Lehre von den griechischen Präpositionen. Part I. 8vo. vii. 96 pp. Frankfurt. 2 Mk. 40.
- Mommsen* (Th.) et Marquart (J.) Manuel des antiquités Romaines traduit de l'Allemand et publié sous la direction de G. Humbert. Vol. I.: Le droit public Romain traduit par P.-F. Girard. 8vo. xxiv. 430 pp. Paris. 10 fr.
- To be completed in 11 volumes, several of which are in the press.
- Monumenta Germaniae historica: Poetae Latini aevi Carolini*. Vol. III. part I.: rec. L. Traube. 4to. vii. 256 pp. Berlin. 8 Mk. (writ. paper 12 Mk.)
- Müller* (H. D.) und *Lattmann* (J.) Griechische Grammatik für Gymnasien. Auf Grundlage der vergl. Sprachforschung bearbeitet. Part II. Syntax. 8vo. x. 214 pp. Göttingen. 2 Mk. 40. (I. II. 4 Mk. 60.)
- Penka* (K.) Die Herkunft der Arier. Neue Beiträge zur histor. Anthropologie d. europ. Völker. 8vo. xiv. 182 pp. Teschen. 5 Mk. 20.
- Poirct* (J.) Essai sur l'éloquence judiciaire à Rome pendant la République. 8vo. 299 pp. Paris. 15 fr.
- Rappold* (I.) Beiträge zur Kenntniss des Gleichnisses bei Aischylos, Sophokles und Euripides. 8vo. 27 pp. Leipzig. 1 Mk.
- Ruschnann* (Th.) Nachträge zu Alexander Trallianus aus Philumenus und Philagrius nebst einer bisher noch ungedruckten Abhandlung über Augenkrankheiten. Nach den HSS. hrsg. und übersetzt (extr. Berl. Studien). 8vo. 189 pp. Berlin. 6 Mk. 60.
- Reisig* (K.) Vorlesungen über latein. Sprachwissenschaft. Mit den Anmerkungen von F. Haase. 3. Theil neu bearbeitet von J. H. Schmalz und G. Landgraf. Lfg. 9 u. 10. 12mo. Berlin. 4 Mk.
- Reuter* (A.) De Quintiliani libro qui fuit corruptae eloquentiae. 8vo. vi. 77 pp. Breslau. 2 Mk.
- Robert* (C.) Archäologische Märchen aus alter und neuer Zeit. 8vo. VII. 205 pp. 5 plates, 7 cuts. Berlin. 6 Mk.
- Part 10 of Philologische Untersuchungen hrsg. von A. Kiessling u. W. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf.
- Schiller* (H.) Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit. Vol. II. Von Diokletian bis zum Tode Theodosius des Grossen. 8vo. viii. 492 pp. Gotha. 9 Mk. (I. II. 27 Mk.)
- Schoenemann* (I.) De lexicographis antiquis, qui rerum ordinem secuti sunt quaestiones praeursoriae. 8vo. 116 pp. Leipzig. 2 Mk.
- Schmidt* (F. W.) Kritische Studien zu den griechischen Dramatikern, nebst einem Anhang zur Kritik der Anthologie. Vol. II. Zu Euripides. 8vo. iv. 511 pp. Berlin. 14 Mk. (I. II. 22 Mk.)
- Seck* (Otto). Die Quellen der Odyssee. 8vo. viii. 424 pp. Berlin. 9 Mk.
- Sophocles*. Antigone. With critical and explanatory notes (in modern Greek) by D. Semitelos, Professor at the University of Athens. 8vo. 720 pp. Athens and Constantinople. 14s.
- Steiger*. De Versuum paeonicorum et dochmiacorum apud poetas graecos usu ac ratione. I. 4to. 52 pp. Leipzig. 1 Mk. 50.
- Uscner* (H.) Altgriechischer Versbau. Ein Versuch vergleichender Metrik. 8vo. 127 pp. Bonn. 2 Mk. 80.
- Virgile*. Œuvres complètes traduites en français par Th. Cabaret-Dupaty. 12mo. iv. 400 pp. Paris. 3 fr. 50c.
- Traduction française par A. Collignon. 12mo. 240 pp. Portrait and 8 illustrations. Paris. 1 fr. 50c.
- Weise* (P.) Quaestionum Catoniarum capita V. 8vo. 172 pp. Göttingen. Leipzig. 3 Mk. 60.
- Wiegand* (H.) Platäa zur Zeit des Einfalls der Perser in Böotien. 4to. 19 pp. Leipzig. 90 pf.
- Wilhelm* (O.) Zur Motion der Adjektiva dreier Endungen im Griechischen insbesondere bei Homer und Hesiod. 4to. 23 pp. Coburg. 1 Mk.
- Wilkins* (H.) Quaestiones de Strabonis aliorumque rerum Gallicarum auctorum fontibus. 8vo. 60 pp. Marburg. 1 Mk. 20.
- Winnelfeld* (H.) Hypnos. Ein archäologischer Versuch. 8vo. 37 pp. 3 plates. Stuttgart. 3 Mk.
- Xénophon*. Economique, avec introduction et notes par L. Humbert. 12mo. xiv. 146 pp. Paris. 2 fr.

The Classical Review

APRIL 1887.

THE LATE MASTER OF TRINITY AS A PLATONIC SCHOLAR.

ONE reflection can hardly have failed to suggest itself to any one who has tried to estimate Thompson's classical work; that is to say, that, in bulk at least, the tangible printed result of it is strangely small—small as compared not merely with the ample achievements of German industry, but with the performance of such English scholars as Munro or Conington. As the fruit of a long life and of abundant leisure we have editions of two among Plato's dialogues, a few essays contributed to classical periodicals, and the notes to Archer Butler's lectures: the whole indeed might be bound together in a single volume of moderate size. But no greater mistake could be made than to estimate by the extent of these writings either their intrinsic importance or the activity of the mind which produced them. For if Thompson has written little, every line of that little tells. Nowhere will the reader meet with a hasty or a purposeless sentence: not a word but has passed the test of perhaps the most fastidious judgment that the present generation of scholars has seen. All who were ever associated with him in examining the work of others learnt to appreciate the searching and subtle discernment with which the Master sorted the chaff from the wheat: but however severe might be the standard which he applied to the performance of other men, it falls far short of that by which he tested his own. Accordingly we have in his published writings the very best work which could be given us by a singularly clear and acute intellect, fortified by wide and varied study. And however much we may regret that years of feeble health have left the sum of it so small, yet we could hardly wish it increased by any relaxation of the author's critical austerity.

The paper on the *Sophist* was originally published in the *Cambridge Philosophical Transactions*, and is reprinted in volume

NO. II. VOL. I.

VIII of the *Journal of Philology*, preceded by an apology for its reappearance which few readers will consider necessary. This is a reply to an article of Dr. Whewell's in which the Platonic authorship of the *Sophist* and *Politicus* was impugned. At the present day perhaps no serious student of Plato, in this country at least, will be found to assail the authenticity of these dialogues: but when Thompson's apology was written, this was far from being the case. The attack, which some German scholars, notably Socher, had begun, was enforced by all the reputation and controversial vigour of Dr. Whewell, and the appearance of so able an advocate for the defence was proportionally opportune. The prevalence of the view adopted by Whewell would, at least in the opinion of the present writer, have exercised an effect upon the study of Plato and of Greek philosophy little short of paralysing; while nothing could be more stimulating to such study than Thompson's mode of defence. The essay upon the *Sophist* is not only a cogent vindication of the genuineness of the dialogue, but the first really serious effort (in English at least) to assign to it its due position among the Platonic writings and to survey its relations to other dialogues. The *Sophist* is handled, not as one of a collection of miscellaneous essays, each of which treats its subject or subjects from a point of view which varies with the author's humour, but as forming part of a body of philosophical teaching which possesses a definite aim and significance. In this spirit we see the Platonic method of logical division examined and elucidated, appraised both in its intrinsic importance and in relation to the Platonic system, and surveyed in its bearings upon earlier and contemporary Greek thought. The several subjects treated in the dialogue are co-ordinated with a clearness which must have been a revelation to those who had studied the work only with such light as

Stallbaum sheds upon it. And not the least instructive part of the dissertation is that in which the writer insists upon the necessity that the student of Plato shall be keenly on the watch for those perpetually recurring allusions to contemporary or previous thinkers, which, in proportion as they are perceived or missed, go far to determine the apprehension or misapprehension of a whole dialogue. For however fully this may now be recognised, Thompson was probably the first to set it in a clear light. All is done with the ease and sureness of touch which betoken the true master of his subject: even in details where we may not accept his conclusions, we feel no less powerfully the suggestiveness of his method. The essay in fact remains a model of the spirit and manner in which Plato should be studied.

The 'Introductory Remarks' on the *Philebus*, originally prepared for a course of lectures in 1855, were first printed in 1882 (*Journal of Philology*, vol. xi.). This, considered in relation to the dialogue with which it is concerned, is really but a fragment. But, although it cannot be regarded as equal in importance to the defence of the *Sophist*, the work is of the same high order of excellence. There is the same literary finish, the same lucidity in following up the intricate meanderings of this difficult work, and above all the same firm grasp of Plato's position in the history of philosophy. Plato's attitude towards his forerunners and contemporaries has probably never been better described than at the beginning of this essay:—'It is characteristic of Plato's philosophical genius that he is ever seeking for truths amid heaps of seeming error—ever trying to detach the gold from the dross, and to recast it in the mould of his own comprehensive system. . . . He seems to have made it matter of conscience to acquaint himself with whatever had been written before, and whatever was published during his own life, by anyone pretending to the name of sophist or philosopher. And he was not only the most comprehensive, but all appearances to the contrary notwithstanding, one of the most candid of readers. There were in fact very few—I doubt if there was more than one—of his more considerable opponents, with whom he does not to a certain extent agree; or more than one to some portion of whose speculations he has not assigned its due place in his own philosophical structure.' Compare these sayings with the spirit in which Grote approaches (for example) the question be-

tween Plato and Protagoras, and the contrast between the two methods needs no further illustration: nor, one would think, can there be much doubt which method is the more philosophical. In a similar vein is the treatment of the problem concerning the 'One and the Many' a little later on. The whole essay in fact, like that on the *Sophist*, is throughout stimulating and suggestive.

A review of works so well known to Platonic students as the editions of the *Phaedrus* and the *Gorgias* were as superfluous as unsuitable to the compass of the present article. As might be expected in his most carefully matured writings, we find here all the highest qualities of Thompson's work. In lucidity of exposition, in aptness of illustration, in the ease and grace of the translations, these two commentaries will well hold their own with any which could be brought into comparison with them. Indeed we should have far to seek for a combination of accurate scholarship, logical acumen, and literary excellence, similar to that which is presented to us in these volumes. Some perhaps might be disposed to complain of an occasional tendency to discursiveness, natural to a more leisurely style of scholarship than that characteristic of the present day: but if the editor is not always eager to say his say in the fewest possible words, he never loses sight of the point nor intrudes irrelevant matter. Nor is there any display of knowledge for its own sake. Thompson carried his learning lightly: the knowledge he had acquired lay easily upon his mind and did not crave continual escape on paper. The reader of his commentaries is impressed sooner by his taste, judgment, and scholarship than by his learning; yet none but a learned man could have written the commentaries: only we have, as it were, the distilled spirit of his knowledge rather than the crude materials.

As interpretations of the two dialogues these editions are not likely to be soon superseded. Besides the skilful treatment of difficulties in detail, the general drift and arrangement of the two works is handled in a manner no less original than masterly. Both in the *Gorgias* and in the more difficult *Phaedrus*, one feels that the editor has a perfectly definite conception of the course and development of the discussion; we are never left to drift with the current, ὥσπερ τὰ ἀνερμάτιστα πλοῖα: our pilot knows his bearings. And again the dialogues are not treated as isolated disquisitions, but as integral parts of the Platonic system. Specially instructive and

interesting are the two appendices on the 'Erotic discourses of Socrates,' and 'The philosophy of Isocrates.'

In fine, the permanent value of Thompson's work as a Platonic scholar is to be found not in its extent, which is but moderate, nor altogether in the amount of positive instruction, great as that unquestionably is, which may be derived from it; but in the example he has left of an original and powerful mind dealing with the most fruitful literature of all time. It has been said, and said most truly, that Plato is his own best interpreter: but he will interpret only to him who has 'eyes in his soul.' And for clearing and strengthening this mental vision, there could not be a much

better discipline than following the treatment of the philosopher's works by one whose insight into his spirit has hardly been surpassed. Thompson was in his element as an exponent of Plato. No other author could have given such full scope to the fastidious and subtle taste, to the clear logical thought, to the erudition free from any shadow of pedantry, which are characteristic of the Master of Trinity's work; nor have afforded occasion for so successful a combination of all the most solid qualities of learning and scholarship with a charm of style which gives these writings, apart from their didactic value, a claim to rank as English literature.

R. D. ARCHER-HIND.

THE AEOLIC ELEMENT IN THE *ILIAD* AND *ODYSSEY*.

Die Homerische Odyssee in der ursprünglichen Sprachform wiederhergestellt von AUGUST FICK. Göttingen, 1883.

Die Homerische Ilias nach ihrer Entstehung betrachtet und in der ursprünglichen Sprachform wiederhergestellt von AUGUST FICK. Göttingen, 1885-6.

Philologus, xliii. 1. Dr. K. Sittl, 'Die Äolismen der Homerischen Sprache.' 'Herr Dr. Karl Sittl und die Homerischen Äolismen,' von DR. GUSTAV HINRICHS. Berlin, 1884.

Bezzenger's Beiträge zur Kunde der Indogerm. Sprachen. Vol. xi. 'Die Sprachform der altionischen und altattischen Lyrik.' A. FICK.

THE peculiar structure of the Homeric dialect has been explained in two ways, viz. (1) as the result of a fusion of earlier Aeolic ingredients with the Ionic dialect, (2) as a combination of earlier and later forms alike belonging to the Ionic dialect at different stages of its growth. The former view was long accepted without question, and the Aeolic element was magnified in accordance with the prevailing idea, that the Aeolic dialect was once common to nearly all Greece—an inference derived from Strabo and other writers, according to whom the whole country was at first 'Aeolian,' except the distinctively Dorian and Ionian districts. On this supposition everything which appeared archaic in the Homeric language was termed an 'Aeolism.' Recent writers of such authority as Meister and Hinrichs,

while carefully distinguishing between Aeolic and merely archaic forms, admit a considerable residuum of the former, comprising the pronouns ἄμμες, ἄμμι, ἄμμε, ὕμμες, ὕμμι, ὕμμε, the adverbs ἄμνδῖς and ἄλλνδῖς, ζα for δια in ζάθεος, ζατρεφής, ζάκοτος, &c., the suffix -εινo for -ειvo (εσ-ειvo), e.g. ἀργεινός, ἐρεβεινός, the vocalisation of the digamma in ἀνίαχοι (ἀφίαχοι), ἀνέρυσαν (ἀφφέρυσαν), εὔαδε (εσφαδε). Meister (*Die Griechischen Dialecte*, p. 19) holds with Hinrichs that 'the origin of these Aeolisms must be sought in the oldest epic poems which appeared on Aeolian soil, probably in Lesbos.' He does not doubt that among the predecessors of Sappho and Alcaeus were Aeolian poets who, before Homer, had celebrated the heroes of the Trojan war.

Hinrichs has recently restated and defended the conclusions embodied in his work (*De Homericæ elocutionis vestigiis Aeolicis*) against an attack by K. Sittl (*Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, ch. ii. pp. 34-44, and *Philologus* xliii. 1, p. 1-31), who has attempted to disprove the whole, or nearly the whole, of the supposed Homeric Aeolisms.¹ In reference to the instances just quoted, he maintains that ἄλλνδῖς and ἄμνδῖς, though not actually found in the extant fragments of Aeolic poetry, are strictly analogous to the Aeolic τῦνδε, &c., nor is it at all probable that the grammarians found ἄλλοδῖς and ἄμοδῖς and 'Aeolised' these forms. The Homeric ἐπασσύτερος (for

¹ Herr Dr. Karl Sittl und die Homerischen Äolismen, G. Hinrichs. Berlin, 1884.

ἐπιστοτότερος) is compared by Sittl with τηλέγετος and αἰσρομένητης, with the view of showing that the ε may be original and not an Aeolic variation. But the latter word is probably of Aeolic origin and itself exemplifies the Aeolic ε for ο, since it is equivalent, according to Curtius, to αἰσρομένητης from αἶσα and the root μυα ('one who minds the rights' of the competitors). As for τηλέγετος (which may likewise be an old Aeolic word), according to Savelsberg's highly probable explanation, it implies an adjective τηλός :- 'large' (τηλέγετος, 'large-grown,' i.e. adult, cf. τηλέπελος, 'large-gated'), but there is no such evidence of an adjective αἰσρός. The connection of ἐπιστοτότερος with μωχρός has been questioned; but there is less room for dispute as to the connection of ἀρέμωρ with ῥήμος. (See the last edition of Curtius' *Grundzüge*.) Sittl rejects the explanation of ἐέκοι, ἑέοι, ἐέδοι, as having been originally formed with ε replacing the initial digamma (ἐέκοι, ἑέοι, ἐέδοι). He supposes that ἐέκοι (ὀέέκοι) was written with ε prefixed ἐέέκοι, but he is obliged to assume that ἑέοι, &c., are formed by erroneous analogy, the ε being prefixed although no initial consonant has dropped out. As regards the masculine nominatives in ᾱ (e.g. ἑπρότα), which Sittl (here supported by Meister) would account for as converted vocatives, Hinrichs adheres to the view that they are to be explained by the Aeolic accentuation and the omission of final σ, which occurs in some Boeotian inscriptions. Moreover, as Mr. Monro observes (*Homeric Grammar*, § 96), the other theory 'is not necessarily at variance with the Aeolic origin of the forms. If the usage began as a piece of ceremonial etiquette, it may well have been due to the influence of great Aeolic families.' Sittl objects to ζῶν (*Od.* xi. 313), but there appears to be no valid reason against classing it, as Ahrens does, with the Aeolic accusatives ἀντρέων, ἀβάνων, ἐμφέων, &c. He would likewise correct ἀπιδλήτων (*Od.* xi. 311) and one or two similar survivals of Aeolic verbs in -μ, but Curtius has shown (cf. Monro's *Homeric Grammar*, § 19) that these forms are exactly parallel to the Homeric φιλήμεναι, καχήμεναι, &c. He is willing to allow that the Homeric πάριες may be directly related to the Lesbian πάριες, but he suggests that the Ionians borrowed the Aeolic form of the numeral through commercial intercourse. In regard to Aeolic ο for α (before liquids), he demurs to the evidence of πῶρεαλις (for πᾶρεαλις) for no better reason than that the word itself is not of Greek origin. But we have a clear

example in the old formula ὄρχαμος ἀνδρῶν, if ὄρχαμος is connected with ἄρχω, and the old epithet ἀργειφόντης, assuming the derivation from φαίω, whether the word is interpreted 'swiftly appearing' or 'making the light (or lightning) to appear.' The difficult αἰζήλος (or αἰδῆλος) may also be Aeolic. Hinrichs' interpretation 'ever visible' (Aeolic αἰ for αεί, cf. αἰπάρθετος) gives the best sense in *Il.* ii. 318. The original form would appear to have been αἰδῆλος, which was altered to distinguish it from αἰδῆλος ('destructive'). The evidence of Aeolic ε for α before ρ, which is deducible from Θερσίτης and other proper names, is not to be set aside simply because similar names occasionally appear in later times outside the Aeolian area; though it is possible that Θέρσος is an older form, rather than a dialectic variation, of θάρσος. (See Monro, in the *Journal of Philology*, vol. ix. p. 264.) Another Aeolic peculiarity (φ for θ) seems to have survived in the Homeric φῆρες for θῆρες (cf. Latin *fera*.) The fact that this form appears only as a personal name (of the Centaurs) may serve to explain the survival, but is no argument against the Aeolic origin of the word. The conversion of the digamma in ταλαίριος equally implies the Aeolic ε for α, if the word is written ταλαίριος and derived directly from τ(α)λα :- 'to bear' ('bearing a shield of ox-hide'). This substitution of ε for ε is undoubtedly characteristic of the Aeolic of Lesbos, and words of similar formation in Homer are numerous (e.g. καλαίρηψ, εἴληρα, παναίριος, εἰκῆλος, besides those above mentioned). The Homeric text abounds in instances of the Aeolic prefix ζα, occurring, just as might be anticipated, in ancient epithets, and especially those of Aeolic towns. This evidence would remain equally applicable, even if it could be proved that ζά was not used by itself as the equivalent of δαί in the Lesbian poetry, as Sittl contends. (He takes leave, however, to alter ζά to δαί in Sappho fr. 87, ζά δ' ἐλεξάμεν ὄναι Κυπρογενή.) Nor is there any relevancy in the comparison between the Ionic variation λαγός for λαγός, and the forms ἔρος and γέλος (with dative ἔρω, γέλω, and accusative ἔροι, γέλωι) which are common to the Homeric and the Aeolic dialect, and are quite distinct in their formation from the post-Homeric ἔρωτ- and γέλωτ-.

Fick's argument postulates these and other occasional Aeolisms in the Homeric dialect; but his special theory—that by far the greater portion both of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* was originally composed in the

Aeolic dialect—depends, in the main, on those elements which belong to the very ground-work of the Homeric language, such as the alternative forms of the personal pronouns instanced above. Those who deny the composite character of the dialect can only meet the argument, which these forms supply, by maintaining that they co-existed with the others in the Ionic dialect, either as part of the ordinary speech or as poetical varieties. Sittl attempts to diminish the difficulty of this assumption, in reference to the pronouns, by changing ἄρμες and ἔρμες into ἀρές or ἀρμές (= ἀσμές) and ἔρμές (= ἵσρμές), from which, he suggests, ἡμέες and ἱμέες may have been derived through ἡμές and ἱμές. But the theory of an old-Ionian origin rests on a very uncertain basis of conjecture. And, while the evidence of the extant Aeolic poetry undoubtedly supports the theory of an Aeolian origin, as far as it goes, it will be shown that the evidence of the extant Ionic poetry tells the wrong way.

Fick includes in the Aeolic element other forms, which must be regarded as fundamental, *e.g.* the infinitive terminations -μεναι and -μεν, the genitive endings -αιο and -αων, and the genitives formed by the suffix -θεν (ἔμεθεν, σέθεν, φέθεν), and the dative plural ending -εσσι, which occurs uniformly in Aeolic and never in Ionic texts (except a dubious fragment of Ananias, ἀλλὰ πᾶσιν ἰχθύεσσιν). This Aeolic element, he holds, can only be explained on the supposition that it represents the original text, on which the Ionic forms were engrafted by a simple process ('*ganz roh und äusserlich*') of translation. In order to test this theory, he has performed the reverse process—a retranslation into the Aeolic dialect—with results, which may be thus summed up: (1) The intermixture of Aeolic and Ionic forms is determined by the metre. The Ionic forms are adhered to, as a rule, where the metre allows; while the Aeolic forms are retained chiefly as a matter of metrical necessity or convenience. (2) Certain portions of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* present obstacles to retranslation, such as imply that the author or authors of these sections composed them in the Ionic dialect, only copying the traditional 'Epic' phrases. These additions consist, for the *Iliad*, chiefly of passages inserted as connecting links to unite various episodes with the body of the poem, the episodes themselves having been composed at a somewhat earlier date by poets, perhaps of Ionian extraction, but well versed in the Aeolic dialect. The episodes in question are

the Catalogue of the Ships (which was probably imported from the Cypria with some alteration), the meeting of Glaucus and Diomedes (*Il.* vi. 119–236), the Embassy (bk. ix.), the Doloneia, the Shield of Achilles, and the Funeral Games. But the speech of Phoenix in the Embassy, and the Μάχη παραποτάμιος (bk. xv.) likewise betray an Ionic hand, being '*stark mit festen ionismen versetzt*.' For the *Odyssey*, the portions which Fick would assign on linguistic evidence to Ionian authorship, prove to be exactly identical with those which Kirchhoff, arguing from the subject-matter alone, had already assigned to an editor, who expanded the four component poems into nearly their present shape.

Fick has made the further conjecture that the Ionic reviser, who completed the two poems, was the Cynaethus, whose memory is preserved in the account quoted from Hippostratus by the scholiast on Pindar, *Nem.* ii. 1. 'The name of Homeridae was originally given to the descendants of Homer, who continued the recitation of his poetry. This was done subsequently by rhapsodists not connected with Homer by descent; among these were conspicuous Cynaethus and his school, who are said to have composed many of the verses and inserted them in the poetry of Homer. This Cynaethus was a native of Chios. He is said to have composed the hymn to Apollo, the hymn thus entitled being one of the poems inscribed as Homer's. This Cynaethus first rhapsodised the Epic poetry of Homer at Syracuse in the 69th Olympiad, according to Hippostratus.' The testimony of this writer is valuable on the point in question, as his special subject was Sicily. The other extracts collected by Carl Müller show that he compiled quasi-historical records in the form of genealogies, embodying the local traditions. One fragment, for example, relates to the Cottytia, a festival celebrated in Sicily and at Corinth. The statement that this rhapsodist was also the composer of the hymn to (the Delian) Apollo is supported not only by Pliny (*H.N.* iv. 12, 22) but by the internal evidence of the alternative conclusion (v. 14–18) adapted to a Syracusan audience. That he was the reviser of the *Odyssey* is rendered very probable by the interpolated reference to Ortygia (*Od.* v. 121–4), the forced allusion to the palm-tree by the altar of Apollo in Delos (vi. 161–7. Cf. the hymn, v. 18 and v. 117), and the marked references to Sicily and South Italy (i. 184, xx. 383, xxiv. 211, 338, 365 ff.). The completion of the *Iliad*

is ascribed to this poet partly on the evidence of an interpolation in the Catalogue (*Il.* ii. 594-600), describing the blindness of Thamyris, the Thracian minstrel, whom the Homerids would claim as a predecessor, if not as an ancestor. The author of the hymn makes particular mention of his blindness at the same time that he sings his own praise:— 'Fare ye well, ladies all, and bethink ye of me hereafter, when any of earthly kind coming hither, a stranger worn with travel, enquireth of you: "Damsels, what man among the minstrels who resort hither is most welcome unto you, and in whom do ye chiefly delight?" Then give ye a kindly answer, one and all: "'Tis a blind man, and he dwelleth in rugged Chios. His song will

be prized even in aftertime." And I will spread your renown upon the earth, as far as I roam among the fair-lying cities of men.' The whole tenour of this speech, as well as the mention of the poet's migration, is certainly appropriate to the rhapsodist, who had made his name famous by his additions to 'Homer.' The object for which, according to Fick, these additions were made, was the competitive recitation by rhapsodists at the Delian festival, introduced, perhaps, about the time when the Ionian revolt was preparing and the Ionians were drawn together by an impulse of patriotism. (Cf. Professor Sayce in the *Academy*, Nov. 15, 1884).

G. C. WARR.

(*To be continued.*)

EARLY CLASSICAL MSS. IN THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

THE starting of a Classical Review in England affords an opportunity for attempting a piece of work, which, if rightly carried out, will be of no small advantage to scholars who may be engaged upon the texts of Greek and Latin authors, and, it may be hoped, also of interest to students in general. This work is the compilation of a brief catalogue of all existing MSS. of Greek and Latin classical literature in the libraries of the United Kingdom. Such a scheme can only be successfully accomplished by cooperation; but it may be anticipated that there will be no lack of assistance in the universities and large central libraries where the greater number of MSS. are accumulated. It may be objected that the catalogues of the several libraries should suffice; but, as every librarian knows, older catalogues are far from accurate, particularly in the matter of assigning dates, and in most large libraries the catalogues are inconveniently numerous, requiring in some instances rather severe study for the digestion of their contents. Moreover, in some libraries the catalogues are still unprinted. To lead the way, then, in this proposal, I hope to contribute from time to time to the pages of the *Classical Review* concise descriptions of the MSS. of early Greek and Latin writers in the British Museum. As an introduction to the work, the present article may be devoted to a notice of the classical papyri, which, from their great antiquity, occupy a preeminent position of their own.

Of the very few surviving classical Greek works written on papyrus, the most important have, one by one, found their way into the British Museum. This is matter for consolation; for the national collections are by no means strong in ancient copies of the Greek and Latin classics. In these days one cannot hope to make up much lost ground in this respect. The most precious vellum texts are already safely housed in public libraries. But papyri may still be unearthed from the tombs of Egypt. The great collection of documents now at Vienna and Berlin, among which many rare fragments have already been brought to light, and which are being subjected to the close labour of competent scholars, will probably yield important results. And when we bear in mind that the papyri, which it is proposed to form the subject of the present paper, have all been purchased within the last thirty years, we need not altogether despair of the future.

The Greek classical papyri of the British Museum are five in number. Two contain portions of two of the books of the *Iliad*: three, the orations of Hyperides. They have all been described at some length in the *Catalogue of Ancient Manuscripts in the British Museum* (part 1, Greek, London, 1881); I will briefly sketch their history and palaeographical value.

1. The Harris Homer (Papyrus cvii.). This papyrus is in two fragments which were obtained by Mr. A. C. Harris of Alexandria on two different occasions, in 1849

and 1850, from a tomb, known as the Crocodile Pit, at Ma'abdey near Monfalat, the second fragment being the first that was found. Both fragments were purchased for the Museum in 1872. They contain portions of book xviii. of the *Iliad*, viz. (1) lines 1—171 and, in a broken column, the first words of ll. 172—218, and (2) ll. 311—617. The papyrus is much discoloured, so much so indeed that the text requires a good light for the rather painful process of reading. For this reason it has been printed in full in the Catalogue. The writing is in slender uncials, generally upright, sometimes almost sloping back to the left. The regularity of the hand and its natural freedom, without trace of the artificiality which can generally be detected in imitative writing, has led me to venture to assign this papyrus to the first century B.C. But our palaeographical knowledge of these remote times is still but scanty. The documents are rare, and until more are brought to light, and until sufficient facsimiles are printed and collected together, we cannot hope to attain to that exact education of the eye which familiarity with the objects alone can give. I may notice in this place that a remarkably bad facsimile of a few lines from this Homer which was printed in Gerhard's *Archäolog. Zeitung*, 1849, gave birth to the myth that the rough breathing appears in the line of writing in the shape of an open *a*, which has been quoted as a noteworthy fact in the handbooks on Greek Palaeography.

2. The Bankes Homer (Papyrus cxiv.). This papyrus is in one piece, measuring upwards of seven feet, and containing sixteen columns of writing. It was bought by Mr. W. J. Bankes at Elephantine, in 1821, and passed into possession of the British Museum in 1879. The text is book xxiv. of the *Iliad*, wanting the first 126 lines; well known by the collation published by George Cornewall Lewis in the *Cambridge Philological Museum*, in 1832. This is one of the few surviving MSS. which contain stichometrical notes, every hundred lines being numbered in the margin. From its first discovery the Bankes Homer has taken high rank as a most ancient MS., and has been quoted with veneration in palaeographical and other works. In the Museum Catalogue, however, it is assigned to the second century of our era. This later date will probably prove in the end to be much nearer the mark than the more remote century before Christ in which it has been placed. The writing is in round uncials and much more nearly resembles the book-hand

of the early Biblical Codices of the fourth and fifth centuries than the writing of the Ptolemaic period.

The papyri containing the orations of Hyperides are, as already stated, three in number, that is, they form three numbers in the Museum Catalogue. Two of them, however, originally formed part of the same roll and must be taken together. The evil practice of the Arabs, who break up papyri which they discover in order to make, as they think, better bargains by disposing of them piecemeal, is answerable for their mutilated condition. All the extant works of the Athenian orator are included in the Museum fragments.

3 and 4. The oration of Hyperides for Lycophron (Papyrus cxv.) and the oration against Demosthenes respecting the Treasure of Harpalus (Papyrus cviii.). The first is a very fine specimen, more than eleven feet in length, and contains forty-nine columns of writing. Mr. Joseph Arden purchased it, in 1847, at Gournou, in the district of Western Thebes. It was bought for the Museum in 1879; by a strange coincidence on the same day on which the Bankes Homer was also acquired. The second is in thirty-three fragments, which came into possession of Mr. Harris in 1847, and passed to the Museum in 1872. The texts of both orations are known by the facsimile editions of Prof. Churchill Babington and Mr. Harris. As to the date of the writing of this fine MS. there are various opinions. It is in very beautifully-formed uncials of, apparently, an unusual type. It has been assigned to as early a period as the second century B.C. The Museum Catalogue makes it a century younger. Dr. Blass goes further: he would place it as low as the period of Hadrian and the Antonines. We must be content for the present to leave the question open and await more light.

5. The Funeral Oration of Hyperides in honour of Leosthenes, the Athenian general, and his comrades who fell in the Lamian war, B.C. 323 (Papyrus xcvi.). This papyrus, in fragments, was purchased in 1857 from Rev. H. Stobart, who procured it in the previous year from the neighbourhood of Thebes. It is well known by the edition of Prof. Churchill Babington. Palaeographically, it has a special interest. On the reverse side is written, among other matter, a horoscope, cast for a person born at the end of the first, or in the middle of the second, century. It was naturally inferred that this was an addition written after the oration had been inscribed on the other side. The

case is, however, exactly the reverse. Dr. Blass, from a close scrutiny of the joints in the papyrus and for other reasons, has conclusively shown that the horoscope is in fact on the *face* of the roll, and the oration on the *back*; and his suggestion that the latter is merely a student's exercise is supported by the existence of many clerical faults and by the character of the writing, which is in the roughly-formed uncial letters of apparently an unpractised hand. These facts bring down the date of the MS. to the second century of the Christian era.

Before concluding, it may be of interest to draw attention to a MS. in the Museum which bears internal and pretty conclusive evidence of having been copied from a prototype written on papyrus. This evidence consists in the gaps left blank in the text by the very conscientious or very ignorant scribe. The MS. in question is the Harley MS. 5792 (*Cat. Anc. MSS.* p. 10), containing a Greek and Latin glossary copied in the seventh century. The words in the two languages being written in parallel columns, it is evident that the scribe has followed exactly the arrangement of the prototype, which must have been, in places, in a very imperfect condition. From the exact way in which the scribe has copied only what he saw, arranging his letters on the plan of the text before him, we can trace the actual shapes of the lacunae; and these shapes lead us to the conclusion that the lacunae were caused by actual rents or holes rather than by abrasions, and that the material was papyrus and not vellum. The strongest piece of evidence occurs in that part of the

glossary which contains words beginning with $\pi\epsilon\phi$. Here there occurs a lacuna in which several successive words in the Greek have entirely disappeared with the exception of those three initial letters, or at most four letters, while the beginnings of the Latin equivalents are also mutilated. In this instance there has evidently been a large hole in the prototype, having on one side an almost even edge cutting the Greek words vertically. Papyrus, as we know, is a material which splits up just in the way indicated by the even edge of the lacuna; whereas a hole in vellum or a defacement upon it would scarcely follow such a straight line. Although not bearing directly upon the present argument, it is interesting to know that such glossaries were actually written on papyrus, although the example on record is not earlier than the sixth century, whereas the prototype of the Harley MS. was probably, from its mutilated condition, of a much older date. In the *Comment. Soc. Göttingen*, iv. (1820), p. 156, and *Rhein. Museum*, v. (1837), p. 301, the fragments of such a glossary are described. In conclusion it may be noted that exact line-for-line or page-for-page reproduction in the middle ages of ancient prototypes was, we know, practised not only in cases where, as in the Harley glossary, the nature of the text required it, but also where illustrative drawings accompanied the text and where it was therefore necessary to maintain the proper arrangement between text and drawing. Some examples of this will have to be considered hereafter.

E. MAUNDE THOMPSON.

THE REFORMED PRONUNCIATION OF LATIN.

For years the prevailing pronunciation of Latin in England has been condemned by all competent judges; and still it has been thought a hopeless task to supplant it. But within the last few months the prospect has suddenly brightened; and the hope that some day the ancient Latin tongue would receive its rights has grown into an expectation that this some day will be soon. The Cambridge Philological Society, stimulated by the efforts of teachers who felt that the old pronunciation and, still more, the jargon of old and new together, was an intolerable burden and anomaly, issued to its members

a scheme of pronunciation prepared for that purpose which, after running the gauntlet of searching criticism, has been published, with certain modifications, in a pamphlet published by Messrs Trübner, and entitled *The Pronunciation of Latin in the Augustan Period*. The scheme was most favourably received by members of the Society, both resident and non-resident; how favourably, may be judged from the fact that out of twenty-seven lecturers in Cambridge, twenty-five were in favour of a reform in the direction proposed, while out of thirteen headmasters, professors, assistant-masters, not

resident in Cambridge, only one was opposed to all reform, the remainder, including six head-masters, either already using the new pronunciation or being willing to adopt it if adopted in the Universities. With the final consideration and adoption of the scheme arose the question of its introduction into practical teaching. This question was obviously twofold: part relating to Cambridge, and part to the outer world. The reformed pronunciation, it was clear, could be introduced into Cambridge without much difficulty. A committee was accordingly appointed, and subsequently enlarged, so as to be representative of the whole University, for that purpose. They have communicated with all the classical professors and lecturers of the University asking them to use the pronunciation of Latin recommended in the scheme in their teaching, and to report any difficulties that they find in using it to the committee. Without being too sanguine, we may say that the reformed pronunciation of Latin will be generally, if not universally, adopted throughout Cambridge in the Michaelmas term. The other question was one of considerably greater difficulty, and importance. Cambridge, although ready and willing to set her own house in order, and undesirous of seeing a genuine movement in favour of reform pass again into inertia, could not take upon herself singlehanded the introduction of the new pronunciation throughout the country. Proposals for cooperation were made to Oxford, and responded to in a like spirit. The Oxford Philological Society, having considered *The Pronunciation of Latin in the Augustan Period*, have passed two resolutions, one expressing their general agreement with the views proposed, and another their opinion that it is generally desirable that the scheme should be adopted in practice, and singling out certain points as specially important. The agreement of the two Societies, which will no doubt have further practical issues, is the greatest step which has hitherto been gained. But that there are difficulties still in the way, some real and some imaginary, cannot be gainsaid; and with these, so far as they concern the 'scheme' itself, we now propose to deal. It is frequently, if silently, assumed, that Latin pronunciation is not sufficiently ascertained to admit of the promulgation of a scheme. This view is based upon an error. Undoubtedly there are disputed points within its range. But they are comparatively few and unimportant; and no body of scholars, however chosen, who understood the question, could draw up a scheme which would differ

in general effect and essential particulars from the present one. Another fallacy hardly less mischievous is the assumption that we should begin with the whole of the changes at once. No such change can be made all at once. With the best intentions it is impossible to change the whole of our pronunciation suddenly. But the ideal should be always kept in view, and fresh advances continually made. To come to details, we see that a very large proportion of the difficulty of the reformed pronunciation arises not from the fact that we do not possess the equivalent sounds in English; but from the fact that the Latin letter has usually a different value in English. This is the case with *ā, ā, ī, ū, ē, ē, s* final, *th, ph* (see below), *i* consonant (*j*), *u* consonant (*v*). To take one or two examples, it is just as easy to us to pronounce *res* as *race* as to pronounce it *reeze*, to pronounce *uas* as *wake* as to pronounce it *vass*; but the analogy of English spelling suggests the other pronunciation. The whole difficulty arises from not treating Latin as French or German, that is as a foreign language in which the native pronunciation of the letters is to be discarded. If Latin were a spoken language, no one would think of pronouncing *nānus nainus*, any more than of pronouncing *āne ain*. Next come the sounds which can be easily learnt from French, several of the vowels, the rolled *r* (also in Scotch), the dentals *t, d, n, l, s*. That the tongue did touch the teeth in the Latin sounds is certain; and there is no difficulty in making it do so. But as the acoustic difference between the English and Latin sounds is not great, it is not a point that need be insisted on at first. The vowels of *maximus* (*maxumus*) and *zythum* are found in French and German. But that they should be given in Latin at present is perhaps too much to expect. The aspirates *ch, th, ph*, if it be found too difficult to pronounce them as *k, t, p*, followed by *h*, should at least be given by *k, t, p*. The point of the scheme which involves most doubt and difficulty is that of final *-m*, and its discussion has been properly placed in a footnote. It is perhaps beyond hope that a pitch accent will be heard on English lips, but the hammering English accent might be so far mitigated as to allow the post-accentual syllables to have their proper length. The desirability of giving the quantities is admitted on all hands; but to do so properly requires some patience and practice. To sum up: all that really can be matter of doubt is the *exact* pronunciation of certain vowels (*ē, ō, ī, y*), the *precise* value of *u* con-

sonant which is in any case very nearly rendered by English *w*, perhaps also that of the diphthongs *ae*, *oe*, and final *m*. In all other cases the correct representative is either actually an English sound, and this in the

great majority of the sounds, or one which is actually taught in our schools to the classes that are learning French.

J. P. POSTGATE.

ON SOME POLITICAL TERMS EMPLOYED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

(Concluded from page 8.)

Δῆμος, λαός.

There are other political terms which are conspicuous by their absence from the New Testament. Δῆμος occurs only four times in the New Testament. The LXX. never use it except for a subdivision of the people, after the analogy of the Attic 'demes.' Δημηγορεῖν in the New Testament means to address a multitude, but not in a constitutional assembly; thus Acts xii. 21: ὁ Ἡρώδης . . . ἐδημηγόρει πρὸς αὐτοὺς. Δῆμος occurs in the same passage (Acts xii. 22): ὁ δὲ δῆμος ἐπεφώνει, Θεοῦ φωνή, κ.τ.λ. Also in Acts xvii. 5: καὶ ἐπιστάτες τῇ οἰκίᾳ Ἰάσονος ἐζήτουν αὐτοὺς προαγαγεῖν εἰς τὸν δῆμον, —in both texts it means multitude, or rabble. It is twice used in the narrative of the Ephesian riot (Acts xix. 30, 33): Παύλου δὲ βουλομένου εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸν δῆμον, ὁ δὲ Ἀλέξανδρος . . . ἤθελεν ἀπολογεῖσθαι τῷ δῆμῳ. We are however expressly told that this was a tumult (στάσις, σὺντροφή and not an ἔντομος ἐκκλησία, vv. 40, 39), and it only receives the name of ἐκκλησία at its orderly and formal dismissal: καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν (sc. ὁ γραμματεὺς) ἀπέλυσεν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν (v. 41). We cannot be mistaken in supposing that one reason why the Jews avoided the word δῆμος as a name of the 'people of God' was because the term had been discredited by the decline of Greek freedom, and the idea of democracy could not survive in a political atmosphere wherein despotism prevailed. Moreover δῆμος was a term at once too technical, and too strictly civic to designate the members not so much of a city as of a nation. The word λαός was just the word required. It had very noble associations in the past history of Greek life. It was a great word with Homer. Though rarely found in old Attic prose, it is a favourite with the poets. It was familiar to Attic ears in the herald's formula Ἀκούετε λάῳ, and was perpetuated in social life through names like Λαοδίκη, Ἀγασίλαος, which will always be found to carry a certain dignity with them. It was used by Plato and again by

Polybius; but it was reserved for Jewish lips to give the word a sacred significance and a world-wide currency.

*Εθρος.

*Εθρος, the correlative of λαός in the mouth of Hellenistic Jews, was a word that never had any importance as a political term until after Alexander. It was when Hellenism pushed on eastward, and the policy of Alexander and his successors founded cities as outposts of trade and civilisation, that the contrast was felt and expressed between πόλεις and ἔθνη. Hellenic life found its normal type in the πόλις, and barbarians who lived κατὰ κόμας or in some less organised form were ἔθνη. Droysen has illustrated this in his *Hellenismus* (iii. 1, p. 31–32). He cites e.g. Arrian, *Indica*, 40: Σουσίῳις δὲ πρόσκοικοι ὅτι εἰσὶν οἱ Οὐξιοί, λέλεκται μὲν κατὰπερ Μάρδοι μὲν Πέρσησι προσεχές οἰκέουσι, λησταὶ καὶ οἴτοι, Κοσσαῖοι δὲ Μήδοισι. καὶ ταῦτα πάντα τὰ ἔθνη αἰμέρωσεν Ἀλέξανδρος . . . καὶ πόλιος ἐπέκτισε τοῦ μὴ νομάδας ἔτι εἶναι, ἀλλὰ ἀρνῆρας καὶ γῆς ἐργάτας, κ.τ.λ. So in the great Smyrna inscription (at Oxford, *C.I.G.* 3137, line 11): ἔγραψεν δὲ πρὸς τοὺς βασιλεῖς καὶ τοὺς δυνάστας καὶ τὰς πόλεις καὶ τὰ ἔθνη. So Teles apud Stob. vol. ii. p. 66 (Teubner text) εἶνοι δέ γε καὶ φρουροῦσι τὰς πόλεις παρὰ βασιλεῖσι καὶ ἔθνη πιστεύονται κ.τ.λ. (are employed by kings to garrison the cities or are put in charge of peoples). In Polybius vii. 9, πόλις καὶ ἔθνη are contrasted repeatedly, and we have also βασιλέων καὶ πόλεων καὶ ἐθνῶν. At the same time because ἔθνος was thus opposed to πόλις it was used not seldom for 'a district united by a federal league.' So Polybius xxvii. 2: τὸ δὲ Βοιωτῶν ἔθνος ἐπὶ πολὺν χρόνον συνιτηρηκὸς τὴν κοινὴν συμπολιτείαν . . . κατελύθη καὶ διασκορπίσθη κατὰ πόλιν. At a later date I find ἔθνος used for the inhabitants of a Roman province (ἐπαρχία): instances may be found in the passages cited by Marquardt, *Röm. Alt.* iv. p. 374 note, and in Wood's *Inscriptions from the*

Odeum (Ephesus), No. 1. These various uses of *ἔθνος* in the Gentile world are exactly reproduced in its employment by the LXX. and the New Testament. Usually it describes the pagan world, outside the Jewish Church. Yet it does occasionally stand for the *λαός* itself: *τοῦ ἔθνους τοῦ Ἰουδαίων* (Acts x. 22). In Acts xxiv. 3, 10 the shade of meaning is ambiguous, and may refer less to the nationality of the Jews than to their grouping into a Roman province; but verse 17 is decisive: *ἐλεημοσύνας ποιήσων εἰς τὸ ἔθνος μου*. So also in Acts xxvi. 4, xxviii. 19, and elsewhere in St. Luke and St. John.

Ἐκκλησία.

Next we must notice the names of public assemblies in the New Testament,—*ἐκκλησία*, *συναγωγή*, *βουλευτής*, *γερονσία*, *συνέδριον*.

Concerning the all-important word *ἐκκλησία* I merely observe in passing that we must banish from our minds all remembrance of its etymology from *ἐκ-καλέσαι* (however correct in itself), inasmuch as the *ἐκκλησία* always and everywhere in Greece was the reverse of an exclusive assembly. Indeed it was the most inclusive word in existence for a constitutional assembly, embracing all free citizens of full age, excluding only aliens, females and *ἄτιμοι*. This is worth remembering in view of comments like that of St. Augustine (*In Ep. Rom. Inch. Expos.* T. iii. Pt. ii. p. 925): ‘*Ecclesia ex vocatione appellata*,’—a form of comment which I have met with occasionally in modern Calvinist manuals (comp. Pearson *On the Creed*, Art. ix. ch. 1, § 3 note, where his good sense and good scholarship do not fail him). The Christian *ἐκκλησία*, if it is to be true to the political origin of its name, must include all those who are enfranchised by Baptism unless they be excommunicate.

Συναγωγή.

Συναγωγή in the LXX. is nearly synonymous with *ἐκκλησία*, see the phrase Lev. viii. 3: *πᾶσαν τὴν συναγωγὴν ἐκκλησίασον ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου*: so Numb. xx. 8; Josh. xviii. 1, etc. In old Attic *συναγωγή* was used of the convening of a board: *συναγωγῆς δὲ τῶν λογιστῶν ἡ βουλὴ αὐτοκράτωρ ἔστω* (*Manual*, No. 37): similarly *ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ συννόμῳ συναγωγᾷ τῶν συνέδρων*, i.e. of the senate of Andania (Andania decree, Dittenberger, *Syll.* No. 388, line 49: 1st cent. B.C.). In the ‘Will of Epikteta’ (2nd or 3rd cent. B.C. *C.I.G.* 2448) *συναγωγή* denotes the ‘assembling’ of the *θίασος* or corporation founded by the bequest. In *C.I.G.* 3069 *συναγωγή* denotes a *θίασος* of Attalists (*Ἰεος*)

of the 2nd cent. B.C. The word therefore before its adoption by the Jews, had formerly a perfectly neutral sense of ‘convening’ an assembly, with a tendency as time went on to become appropriated to the assembling of a sacred brotherhood. Once only in the New Testament is *συναγωγή* used (if then) of a Christian assembly, in James ii. 2, and then it refers to Jewish Christians. *Ἐπισυναγωγή* occurs twice in the New Testament, in Heb. x. 25 of the assembling of the Church on earth, in 2 Thess. ii. 1 of the reunion of the Church in glory.

Βουλή

The word *βουλή* has a very slight hold upon the LXX.; they never use it in a technical sense: e.g. Ps. i. 5: *ἐν βουλῇ δικαίων*: 1 Macc. xiv. 22, in what purports to be a letter from Sparta, *τὰ εἰρημένα ἐν ταῖς βουλαῖς τοῦ δήμου* (!). The title *βουλευτής* occurs twice in a colourless sense in Job iii. 14; xii. 17: and Dr. Field (on Acts ii. 24) notices that the translator of Job aimed at an artificial classicalism. In the New Testament *βουλή* signifies counsel, never council. In St. Mark xv. 43 Joseph of Arimathea is styled *εὐσχήμων βουλευτής*: St. Luke (xxiii. 50) says of him *βουλευτὴς ὑπάρχων*. In both passages the word appears to denote membership of the Sanhedrin; but both SS. Mark and Luke are writing for Gentile readers. Otherwise *βουλή* and *βουλευτής* were not technical terms among the Jews for their Sanhedrin, although we find in Josephus, *Bell. J.* ii. 17 § 1: *οἱ τε ἄρχοντες καὶ οἱ βουλευταί*: and *Ant.* xx. 1 § 2, in an edict of Claudius: *Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν ἄρχουσι βουλῇ δήμῳ Ἰουδαίων παντὶ ἔθνει*.

Γερονσία, πρεσβύτεροι, συνέδριον.

Why then this omission of *βουλή* and *βουλευτής*, terms which designate the most important feature in Greek civic life? And why in their place do we find *γερονσία*, *συνέδριον*, *πρεσβύτεροι*?

Fully to answer this question would take us too far away from our present object into the details of Greek political antiquities. It is enough to say that the *βουλή*, organised after the Attic model, was the key-stone of old Greek democracy. And as such, it was naturally no favourite with the despotisms that succeeded Alexander. Antigonos and Demetrius were the last potentates who affected to be partial to democracy. From their downfall at Ipsus B.C. 301, we may date the destruction of free government in Greek cities. At Ephesus we know from

Strabo, as compared with the extant inscriptions, exactly what took place. Lysimachus allowed the forms of democracy to go on as before; but he established a new board, a *γερονσία*, and its influence was practically dominant. We know nothing of the numbers of this board, nor of their mode of appointment. We do not certainly know what were their legal functions. Those who desire to read the best published discussion of this matter should consult the essay of Menadier already quoted (*Qua condicione Ephesii*, etc. p. 48 foll.). In part iii. of the Greek inscriptions in the British Museum, now in the press, I have had to go over the ground afresh, and restate the question. My results are these:—

(1) The *βουλή* all over Greece declined in importance, and became a mere honorary corporation in the times of the Diadochi and of the Roman senatorial government.

(2) The case of Ephesus is by no means solitary. Not only at Ephesus, but in cities all over Greece, we hear of a *γερονσία* in Roman imperial times; and the presumption is, that what Lysimachus founded in the cities of his dominion, the Romans deliberately encouraged everywhere.

(3) The functions of the Gerousia were probably, in the first instance, religious and ecclesiastical. Thus at Ephesus, I believe the Gerousia to have taken in charge the revenues and general administration of the Artemision only; although from this vantage ground its influence and power was felt in all matters of civil administration.

(4) At Ephesus and elsewhere it is abundantly certain that *οἱ πρεσβύτεροι* and *τὸ συνέδριον* were convertible terms with *γερονσία*. Assuming these statements to be true (and I think they can be proved beyond dispute), we have at once a complete account of the origin of the word Sanhedrin for the sacred council of the Jews. We also understand why *γερονσία* (Acts v. 21), and not *βουλή*, was its recognised Greek name; while *οἱ πρεσβύτεροι* are simply the members of the *γερονσία*. All these terms, so familiar to us first in their Jewish, and afterwards in their Christian usage, had been commonly employed before, in a precisely analogous sense, in Graeco-Roman civic life.

Ἀρχων.

I need say nothing on the word *ἄρχων* after the excellent remarks of Schürer (p. 18 foll.). He shows from Jewish inscriptions what the use of the word in Greek politics would suggest, that with the Jews *οἱ ἄρχοντες* were the official members, the executive of the *γερονσία*.

In the New Testament the word is of frequent occurrence.

Πρεσβεύω.

Some other New Testament words have interesting political associations. Thus the office of ambassador (*πρεσβεία*, Luke xiv. 32; xix. 14; *πρεσβεύω*, 2 Cor. v. 20; Eph. vi. 20), was in everyday use in the intercourse between the Greek cities, and between them and the kings.

Ἰδιώτης.

The word *ιδιώτης*, though of common use in classical Greek for a 'layman' in contrast with the professors of any kind of art, yet perhaps in the New Testament hardly lost the memory of its political origin.

Acts iv. 13, *ἀγράμματοί εἰσι καὶ ἰδιῶται* i.e. not of the official class.

1 Cor. xiv. 16: *τὸν τόπον τοῦ ἰδιώτου.* } i.e.
 „ 23, 24: *ἄπιστος ἢ ἰδιώτης.* }

a member of the Christian *ἐκκλησία*, but an ignorant one.

2 Cor. xi. 6: *ιδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ* = 'no speaker.'

Κήρυξ.

It was reserved for the Gospel to give strange dignity and world-wide importance to the *κήρυξ* (*κηρίσσω*, *κήρυγμα*) a well-known subordinate figure in every Greek assembly, in public games, or other formal gathering.

Ἐκδικος, ἐκδικεῖν.

It has occurred to me whether the favourite LXX. and New Testament terms *ἐκδικος*, *ἐκδικέω*, *ἐκδίκησις* (in the post-classical sense of 'avenger' &c.) may not be derived from the official *Ἐκδικος* (compare *σίνδικος*), a special advocate (champion) of a city (Cic. *ad Fam.* xiii. 56). The word is not uncommon in the Graeco-Roman inscriptions; and the office of the *ἐκδικος* was important and frequently called into use by the Greek cities under Roman rule.

Δόγμα.

Δόγμα was not the regular word in republican Greece for a decree of the *boule* and *demos*; the technical term was *ψήφισμα*, and *δόγμα* (or rather *τὰ δόγματα*, *τὰ δεδογμένα*) an occasional synonym. The following passage of Thucydides illustrates what I mean (iii. 49; when the Athenians countermand their cruel decree respecting Mytilenë): *ἡ μὲν ἔφθασε τοιοῦτον ὅσον Πάχητα ἀρεγνωκέαι τὸ ψήφισμα καὶ μέλλαν ὀρύσσειν τὰ δεδογμένα κ.τ.λ.* The instances of *δόγμα* quoted from the orators by L. and S. s.v. prove no more than this. In later Greek we find *δόγματι* sometimes for the decrees of the Areopagus, *C.I.A.*

iii. 687, 704, 720*b*, 836*b*, 687*a*. Occasionally it occurs elsewhere, as in Crete, *C.I.G.* 2593—2597; 3049 from Silyrtos in Crete; 1193 from Asine and Hermione in Argolis. But the special use of the word *δόγμα* was for a decree of the Roman Senate (*Senatus Consultum, decreto Senatus*):—

C.I.G. 2486. Astypalaea, B.C. 105.

„ 2737*a*.

„ 3197. Smyrna, *temp.* Hadrian.

„ 2905. Priene, B.C. 135.

Mommsen's *Marmor Ancyranum*, iv. 17, *temp.* Augusti.

Hicks, *Manual*, 200, Miletus, B.C. 135.

C.I.A. ii. 424, Attica, 2nd cent. B.C.

Δογματίζειν is also found:—

τὰ δογματισθέντα of *Senatus consulta*, Astypalaea, B.C. 105, *C.I.* 2485.

δογματίζω to decree (honours), of a Greek decree of Cyme, *temp.* Augusti, *C.I.G.* 3524.

δογματίζω in a decree of a *θίασος* (Naples, late) *C.I.G.* 5785.

Side by side with this political use of *δόγμα*, *δογματίζω* was their philosophical use for the *placita philosophorum*, which needs no illustration from me.

The words are used literally by St. Luke, ii. 1, Acts xvii. 7, of the decrees of the Emperor; and in Acts xvi. 4, of the decrees of the Council at Jerusalem. St. Paul used the words in a figurative sense, Eph. ii. 15; Col. ii. 14. And he invents a new and startling meaning for *δογματίζω*, *δογματίζεσθε*—‘decree-ridden,’ Col. ii. 20. The general idea conveyed by the word was a positive ordinance, emanating from a distant and unquestionable authority.

Let me add a word or two concerning the document issued by the Council at Jerusalem. It is interesting to note how it conforms in various particulars to the usual type of Greek public documents. It is a letter, introducing to the notice of the readers a formal decree; though the decree is not appended to the letter as was usually the case (cp. *e.g.* No. 200 of my *Manual*), but is worked into the latter portion of the Epistle itself. I observe the following points of resemblance to regular Greek documents:—

1. The salutation *χαίρειν* etc., only found besides in the New Testament in St. Luke's preface, in Lysias's letter, and the opening of St. James's Epistle.

2. The closing farewell: *ἔρρωσθε* (in Acts xxiii. 30 omitted).

3. The preamble commencing with *Ἐπειδή*.

4. The formal word *ἔδοξε*, *bis*, vv. 25, 28.

5. The sending of envoys to deliver the

decree, and to say the same by word of mouth.

I may remark on two points of interpretation in this document.

1. *γενομένοις ὁμοθυμαδόν* is only a strong expression for ‘assembled all together’ (so Acts v. 12; xii. 20). The decree is not the manifesto of a cabal or a faction, but a decree of the entire Church convened together.

2. That *τὰ αὐτά* must mean ‘the same as the contents of the decree following’ is made absolutely certain by a comparison of a common formula in Greek decrees: let me cite an example from a recently published decree of Priene in acknowledgment of a decree brought by an envoy from Alexandria Troas: *ἐπελθὼν δὲ καὶ Νικασαγόρας ἐπὶ τε τὴν βουλὴν καὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἀκουσούτως διελέγη τοῖς ἐν τῷ ψηφίσματι κατακεχωρισμένοις*. Or this from a letter of Lysimachus to Priene: [*οἱ παρ' ὑμῶν πρὸς ἡμᾶς πρ*]εσβευταὶ Ἀντισθένης [*ς καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ . . . τ*]ό τε ψηφίσμα [*ἀπεδόσαν*] ἡμῖν κ[αὶ αὐτ]οῖς . . . διελέγησαν παραπλησίως τοῖς ἐν τῷ [*ψηφί*]σματι γεγραμμένοις, ἐμφανίζοντες κ.τ.λ.¹ Instances of this kind I might multiply to any extent.

Διαλέγεσθαι.

Let me add that there is a large group of words employed in the New Testament which though not confined in secular Greek to the language of politics, yet were so frequently and systematically employed in public documents, that probably their precise shade of meaning can better be determined from inscriptions than from any other source.

Such a word is *διαλέγεσθαι*, *διαλεγῆναι*, *διαλεχθῆναι*, which occurs in the last two quotations. In these instances, and many more of the same type, *διαλέγομαι* has not the sense of arguing or of conversing, but means primarily to address an assembly, or a king. In the New Testament, with the exception of St. Mark ix. 34, it always is used of addressing, preaching, lecturing, and these instances are all from the Acts.

ὑιοθεσία, ἑοθεσία.

I may note that in Greece, before the Roman Conquest, the custom of adoption had become frequent. In public documents, phrases like the following are of common occurrence (I quote from a Rhodian decree of the 2nd century B.C.): *Εὐφάνισκος Καλλιξείνου καθ' ὑιοθ[ε]σίαν δὲ Νικασιδάμον*.² When St. Paul employs the word *ὑιοθεσία* in his

¹ *Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum*, part iii. section 1, Nos. 419, 402.

² *Ibid.* No. 403, line 2.

Epistles, we need not suppose that he borrowed the idea, any more than he took the word, from Roman usage.

Μαρτυρεῖσθαι.

I have observed in later Greek documents the use of *μαρτυρεῖσθαι μαρτυρία* for 'the good name' witnessed of a man, just in the sense which is employed so powerfully in the New Testament (e.g. Heb. xi.). See a Galatian honorary dedication, *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, 1883, p. 19: Σιλουανὸν Ἰλίου. ... [τα]μνηθέντα [ἐπ]ὶ φυλῆ[ς κ]αὶ ματυ[ρ]ηθέντα ἐ[π]ὶ βουλῆς κ.τ.λ. And Wood's *Inscription from the Great Theatre*, No. 1, Column 6, lines 15 and 21: μαρτυρίας καὶ τειμῆς ἀξιόμμερον.

Φιλοτιμεῖσθαι, φιλοτιμία.

I conclude with *φιλοτιμία*, *φιλοτιμεῖσθαι* perhaps the very commonest words in Greek honorary decrees, so common that it would be difficult to find an honorary decree without them (see e.g. *C.I.A.* ii. *passim*, or any

volume of Greek decrees). The following are specimens of the usual phraseology: *ἐπαινέσαι εὐσεβείας ἕνεκα τῆς εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς καὶ φιλοτιμίας τῆς εἰς τὴν βουλὴν καὶ τὸν δῆμον—τοὺς φιλότιμουμένους πρὸς (εἰς or περὶ) τὸν δῆμον—ἐπεμψαντὴν πομπήν* (superintended the procession) *ὡς ἡδύναντο φιλοτιμότατα*. I quite endorse the note of Dr. Field on Romans xv. 20. The meaning of the verb was clearly to act with public spirit, with devotion to the public and the success of the cause in hand. The transition to actions in which *public* devotion was not possible was easy and natural, so that *φιλοτιμία* scarcely means more than *σπονδή*, with which word indeed it is frequently conjoined in public decrees (*C.I.A.* ii. p. 242; *C.I.G.* 3595.) Similarly Julius Pollux, in his dedication of his *Onomasticon*, says of it: *πεφιλοτίμηται γὰρ οὐ τοσοῦτον εἰς πλῆθος ὅσποσον εἰς κάλλους ἐκλογὴν*; as we should say 'my aim throughout my work has been such and such.'

E. L. HICKS.

ON SOME FAULTS IN MILTON'S LATIN POETRY.

IN A LETTER TO A FRIEND.

MY DEAR PROFESSOR,

It is now some years ago since I had the pleasure of receiving from you a letter in which, referring to a false quantity I had mentioned as occurring in Buchanan's *Alcaic Ode, Maiac' Calendae*, so highly commended by Dr. Johnson and others¹—viz. the participle 'dicatae' used with the first syllable long (*Miscell.* xi. 3), you expressed your surprise that Ruddiman, in his *Vindication of Buchanan*, though he deals with some other charges of false quantity, does not touch the one I had pointed out; and you added: 'the more I consider it, the more I am astonished that such a scholar and poet as Buchanan should have committed such an enormity. Do you know of anything equally gross in any other eminent author?' I have kept your letter by me because I anticipated that a time might come sooner or later when I might wish to give an answer to the question proposed in these last words fuller and more satisfactory than it was in my power to send you at the moment. And such a time has now arrived.

I have always been an admirer of Milton's

Latin poems, who, of all English writers in that department, is, I think, most worthy to be classed with our great literary Scotchman; and having lately read them again somewhat critically, I am tempted to give you the result of my perusal in regard more particularly to the point on which you formerly appealed to me in Buchanan's case. Not that I have any intention of going into them so minutely as the learned Dr. Charles Burney, in his well-known critique (1790), has gone into Milton's two or three short copies of Greek verses; but I shall bring forward enough to answer your inquiry; and at the same time to show that as a Latin verse-writer Milton certainly is not entitled to cast a stone at his Scottish brother on the score of superior exemption from blemishes:

'quas aut incuria fudit,
Aut humana parum cavit Natura;'

and that if Ruddiman was not so sharp-sighted as he ought to have been in his examination of Buchanan, T. Warton and other scholarly critics upon Milton are no less liable to the same charge.

Meanwhile, remembering that I am writing to a learned Professor of Humanity in the

¹ Wordsworth (*Memoirs*, ii. 469) speaks of it as 'equal in sentiment, if not in elegance, to anything in Horace.'

University of which Buchanan was so great an ornament, I shall feel that I am not called upon to enter into much explanation; but may be content merely to name 'the head and front of the offence' which I shall have to indicate in each particular case. Remembering, too, that there was a time when the works of Milton and Buchanan were ordered to be publicly burnt together in the Schools at Oxford (see Macaulay's *Hist.* v. 97), I can well imagine how naturally you may be inclined to smile at this malignant attempt of a modern Oxonian *Tory* and *rank Prelatist* to hang them both as literary culprits on the same critical gibbet!

1. First then, if you desire a gross false quantity which shall be fully a match for Buchanan's 'dicatae,' we know that Milton in his fifth Elegy on the very same subject as Buchanan's *Ode to May-Day*, and in T. Warton's judgment 'far superior to it,' wrote and published in the first edition, 1645, 'quotannis,' with the last syllable short. For this, Salmasius, his violent antagonist, did not spare him. Consequently, in the second edition of 1673, the line (30) was altered, by the substitution of 'perennis,' as it now stands. But we also know that another false quantity scarcely, if at all, less 'enormous'—viz. 'pāruere,' with the first syllable short—is still to be seen in his hexameters 'On the Fifth of November,' (*Sylv.* ii. 165). T. Warton indeed suggests that a defence may be found for it 'by reading it as the *u* consonant; for which (he says) there are authorities.' He refers, I suppose, to cases such as 'pituita' (Hor. Pers.) and perhaps 'fortuito' (Juv.) where 'u' may be taken to represent our 'w.' But I doubt whether these or any other of the examples given in Ramsay's *Prosody*, p. 132 *seq.*, Carey, p. 172 *seq.* are sufficient to justify what Milton has written, and I cannot suppose that he himself contemplated any such justification.

2. Again, no defence can be alleged for making the second syllable of 'sentis' short, as is done in the copy of choliambics (*Sylv.* vii. 3) addressed by Milton to his friend Salsilli. Even if he forgot the rule which forbids such a short syllable, he ought to have remembered the example of Horace—

'Sentis, ac veluti stet volueris dies,'

or of Lucretius—

'Naturam rerum ac persentis utilitatem.'

3. And this brings me to the case of the two copies of choliambics or scazons, in which, though both together they consist of

only forty-nine lines, Milton has broken the invariable law of Latin prosody, which requires an iambus in the fifth foot, no less than eighteen times. Terentianus Maurus gives us the rule very distinctly, and having stated the reason for it, viz. that two spondees may not come together, he warns against its violation:

'Quum tantum iambus hoc loco probe poni,
Aliusque nullus rite possit admitti.' (693 *seq.*)

Warton and Todd both speak of the rule as 'indispensable'; but the latter suggests that Milton 'might perhaps think himself justified by the license admitted into Greek scazons.' It is true that Hipponax, who most probably invented this kind of verse, and that Babrius, who adopted it in his metrical version of *Æsop's Fables*, occasionally allowed themselves to use a spondee in the fifth place; and it is also true that such lines have been deservedly stigmatized by grammarians as '*Ischiorrhogic*,' or 'broken-backed.' But what should we think of a modern Latin versifier, who, in writing sapphics, should introduce a trochee instead of a spondee in the second place (as Sappho has sometimes done), or in writing alcaics, should, in the third line of the stanza make the third foot an iambus, instead of a spondee (as Alcaeus in his few fragments that remain has invariably done); now that Horace, in improving and naturalizing those metres, has uniformly repudiated the said practices; just as Catullus and Martial, whenever they have composed scazons, have rejected the broken-backed alternatives occasionally admitted by Hipponax and Babrius? Even the license which Catullus has taken more than once in his sapphics in imitation of his Greek model, we consider inadmissible in a modern writer, because Horace subsequently abstained from it altogether.

4. Again, I have noted down no less than twenty-seven instances in which Milton has violated another well-known canon of Latin prosody which forbids a short vowel to stand before a word beginning with *sc*, *sp*, or *st*. The law in question (about which there had been a good deal of bungling since Dawes misstated it in his *Miscellanea Critica*) has been thoroughly cleared up by the late Professor Ramsay (p. 260 *seq.*), who, after a full examination of all the evidence bearing upon the point, decides that 'this collocation ought *never* to be introduced into modern Latin poetry.' I confess I have been surprised to find that an ear so nice and delicate as Milton's should have allowed

him to trespass so frequently in this respect. But then I have to bring the same charge even against Vincent Bourne, in whose Latin verses—scarcely more numerous, I suppose, than Milton's—when I last read them I detected thirty-one examples of the same offence. Milton's editor, T. Warton, even if he observed the mistake—which does not I think appear in any of his notes—could not afford to be very severe upon it, having been guilty of the same himself in his beautiful copy of Latin hexameters on *Mons Catharinae*, where we read a verse beginning—

'Corpore spumantemque,' &c.

And it is amusing to observe how the more recent editor of the elegant Aldine edition of Milton does indeed, on three several occasions, draw the reader's attention to the fact of 'the vowel made short before *se*,' in the self-same little note thrice repeated *verbatim* (vol. iii. 260, 275, 295); but has *nothing to say upon the twenty-four other instances of the same fault!* Todd is not less merciful or unobservant than Warton, for he also has passed over every one of the twenty-seven passages *sicco pede!*

So much then for the prosodical peccadilloes of our great author. I am afraid we shall not find him more immaculate when we turn to his use of words.

1. For example, what would you say to any of your students who should bring to you in an exercise such a word as 'surdeat'? See *Eleg.* vii. 90. I suspect you would tell him that you had heard of 'surdesco' but never of 'surdeo.'

2. Or, again, what would you say if an attempt were made to palm off upon you the verb 'liceo' (to be lawful) used in any other form than that of the impersonal 'licet'? And yet Milton writes (*Eleg.* vi. 53):—

'Talibus inde licent convivium larga potestis.'

3. Neither do I imagine you would approve of the verb 'superemineo' being made to govern a *dative* case, as it does in Milton, *Eleg.* vii. 61, whereas in the Roman poets it always appears with an *accusative*.

4. Again, in *Eleg.* vi. 63, and *Sylv.* vi. 51, Milton puts a *genitive* case after 'vacans,' whereas, so far as I know, in classical authors that word is always used either absolutely, or with an *ablative*, although 'vacuus' is found with both cases.

5. I wish you would be so good as to look at *Eleg.* v. 27, and tell me whether you

do not think we ought to read 'utrinque' instead of 'utrique,' at the end of the former of these lines:

'Urbe ego, tu silvâ, simul incipiamus utrique:
Et simul adventum veris uterque canat.'

I am aware that 'utrique' is sometimes, though rarely, used in the plural of two individuals, like 'ambo'; but here it is peculiarly awkward, with the singular following in the next verse.

6. Once more, I have little doubt you will agree with me that there must be something wrong in *Sylv.* ix. 168, where the construction requires an accusative case, *per epexegesis*; and yet we have 'Merlini dolus.' Is it possible that Milton could have fancied at the moment that 'dolus' was a neuter noun?

In pointing out the foregoing blemishes both of versification and grammar, I do not forget that Milton's Latin verses were composed when he was quite young, *i.e.* between the ages of seventeen and twenty inclusive. But then we are obliged also to remember that he himself first gave them to the world in 1645, when he was thirty-seven, and that he republished them in 1673, the year before his death. As I have said, I admire them upon the whole very much; but I think I have shown that the remark thrown out by Johnson with reference to one of the compositions, the copy of seasons addressed to Salsilli, viz. that 'it is not secure against a stern grammarian,' must not be confined to that one production. Probably you yourself, as better fitted for the task, would have found cause to extend the application of the same censure considerably further than I have done.

I am,

Yours very faithfully,

C. WORDSWORTH,

Bp. of St. Andrews.

BISHOPSHALL, ST. ANDREWS.

P.S.—Under the head of false quantities, I have not named 'melôs,' *Sylv.* vi. 37, nor 'egō' (which Ramsay utterly condemns, p. 61), *ibid.* 109, because something may be said for them both on the score of *cæsura*; neither have I included 'mēlos,' to be found twice at the end of a season (viz. *Epigr.* ix. 8, *Sylv.* vii. 22); because Milton, no doubt, had Persius's *Prologue* in mind—which indeed in the former place he has manifestly imitated; but in Persius—as you will know—the best editions, to avoid the false quantity, now read 'Pegaseium nectar.'

REVIEWS.

The Iliad. Edited, with English Notes and Introduction, by WALTER LEAF, M.A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Vol. I. Books I.—XII. London: Macmillan & Co., 1886. 14s.

MR. LEAF announces in his Preface that 'the object of the present edition of the *Iliad* is to offer a guide to students anxious to know more of Homer than they can learn from elementary schoolbooks.' He may be congratulated on having attained this object, and on having done much more.

He has given us a book which is valuable as a monument of his own ripe scholarship, and which will be especially prized by English readers, because it makes accessible to them many of the most recent and most important results of German erudition. Modern Homeric literature grows apace: and it is difficult to overstate the debt of gratitude we owe to a student who will pick out for our benefit the pearls that are set deep in large books, or scattered widely in monographs and periodicals.

The text that Mr. Leaf prints agrees, as he tells us in his Introduction, in most points with Hentze's revision of Dindorf's edition (*Teubn. Series*, ed. 5); and while he refers to the *apparatus criticus* of La Roche, he passes a censure not undeservedly severe on its incompleteness and inaccuracy.

But Mr. Leaf scarcely touches the question of textual criticism himself, and gives only the briefest reference to codd. A, B, C, D, and Townl., remarking that 'none of the other complete MSS. are of special importance.' It is therefore difficult to estimate the grounds of his preference for particular readings, when he accepts them on the vague authority of 'all good MSS.,' 'best MSS.,' 'all the best MSS.,' 'five MSS.,' 'some MSS.,' 'most MSS.,' 'nearly all our MSS.,' 'La Roche and others': though occasionally he presumes a much more detailed knowledge on the part of his readers; as, for example, in the note on K 398, 'βουλεύοιτε . . . ἐθέλοιτε ACDH; βουλεύουσι . . . ἐθέλουσι GL Mori, C (*man. sec.*) and A as a variant.' Mr. Leaf, in his Preface, confesses that 'when once the strict limits of a verbal commentary are passed, it is hard to

know which path to choose . . .'; and, doubtless, he would be the first to acknowledge that the difficulty is at least as great in deciding how much to say, and how much to leave unsaid, in the matter of textual criticism.

He has enriched his commentary with very full explanations of Homeric 'Realien.' On matters connected with the armour of the Greek and Trojan heroes, Mr. Leaf is an original authority of no mean merit, as he has shown by his important contributions to the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*. The recent discoveries at Hissarlik, Mykenae, and Tiryns are freely drawn upon for purposes of illustration; and Helbig's valuable work on Homeric Archaeology is constantly cited. One passage may be noted where Mr. Leaf seems to have made some confusion in quoting this authority. In A 246 the σκῆπτρον of Achilles is described as χρυσείοις ἥλοισι πεπαρμένον, and the note runs thus, 'The golden nails fastened the blade to the handle; cf. A 29, and a full explanation of the whole question in Helbig, H. E. pp. 238 foll.' But there is no blade to attach to a σκῆπτρον, and the parallel passage quoted in A 29, refers not to a σκῆπτρον but to a ξίφος, which is properly described in Helbig, 238 foll. The discussion of the σκῆπτρον will be found on page 278, where it is classed among 'die mit Nägeln beschlagenen Holzarbeiten.'

Sometimes Mr. Leaf seems to modify his views as he goes on, without making the necessary correction; as, for example, in the note on E 722, we read that 'the body of the car was very light, and when not in use was taken to pieces, and put upon a stand; see Θ 441.' But in the commentary on the later passage, it is decided that 'such a construction would seriously interfere with the strength of a chariot.'

In his next edition Mr. Leaf will do well to verify his cross-references, and to bring the orthography of proper names to a more exact harmony. It is the solid excellence of the work that makes us jealous of the *naevi* on the *egregium corpus*.

Mr. Leaf is a conscientious and trustworthy guide in dealing with grammatical

constructions, and analysis of sentences. He has a clear view of his own, and is well abreast of the latest studies in dialectical forms and comparative syntax. Perhaps a more rigid exercise of self-denial would be wiser in questions of etymology. Fanciful derivations, in spite of their charm, are the will-o'-the-wisps of the misty marsh, and too often lead us deeper into the quagmire.

The very few pages assigned in the Introduction to the Origin of the Poems must be regarded as the net result of Mr. Leaf's studies, compressed into the narrowest possible form by the inexorable laws of space. But he makes substantial atonement by the excellent introductions prefixed to each book, on the model of those given in the Ameis-Hentze edition. The relation of the different books to the general poem is clearly set out, and the special difficulties and inconsistencies honestly dealt with. It is satisfactory to see the announcement that the second volume of Mr. Leaf's edition is 'in preparation.'

W. W. MERRY.

The Seven against Thebes of Aeschylus. With an Introduction, Commentary, and Translation, by A. W. VERRALL, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. London: Macmillan & Co., 1887. 7s. 6d.

MR. VERRALL'S edition of the *Seven against Thebes* is highly interesting, and, in a word, an important contribution to classical learning. The notes are full of instruction and suggestion; and he who has a taste for lexicography will find much to enter, sometimes with a query, in his interleaved Liddell and Scott. The translation is a work of the highest art, breathing the very spirit of Aeschylus. Though not in metrical form it is genuine poetry; and will be recognized as such by all who do not believe that metre in its narrowest sense, as distinguished from rhythm, is of the essence of poetry; by all who hold that the Psalms in the Book of Common Prayer are true poetry, and refuse that name to the New Version by Brady and Tate. It is a worthy successor to Prof. Jebb's masterly versions of Sophocles.

But all the excellences of this edition will not redeem it from the charge that it pursues a false method, unless Mr. Verrall succeeds in commending to the acceptance of scholars his views about strophic correspondence. If it is true that to *πίλαις ἐβδόμῃς*, 118, we have a sufficiently close antistrophic response in *στόνων αὐτᾶς*, 132,

then it follows that Hermann's *στόνων ἀπύα* is wrong, because unnecessary, and, further, that a great part of the scholarship brought to bear on the choral portions of Greek Tragedy since the revival of learning has been labour thrown away, the pursuit of an *ignis fatuus*. Mr. Verrall's method revolutionises criticism in an important department of it. He adheres to his principles boldly. He gives in his text *μαινομένα καρδιά*, 766, as the strophic equivalent to *καί σφε σιδαρονόμῳ*, 773. Now this is a case which will serve as a test of his theory. Did the copyist of the Medicean find *κραδία*, and (being ignorant of the existence of strophic correspondence) write *καρδιά*, the form with which he was more familiar? Or did he write down *καρδιά* because he found *καρδιά* in the MS. from which he was copying; strophic correspondence, as we understand it, having no existence in the choral portions of the plays of Aeschylus, but being 'a fond thing vainly imagined' by all modern editors and by many ancient scholiasts? On the answer to this question must largely depend our estimate of the degree of excellence attained by Mr. Verrall's edition. If I agreed with his doctrine as to the limits of strophic correspondence, expounded with characteristic vigour and skill in Appendix I, I should feel constrained by parity of reasoning to give up the rule of the pause, if not the rule which governs the place of the anapaest in the senarius. But I do not feel disposed to accept his view. The copyist, I believe, finding *κραδία* in this passage changed it to *καρδιά*, and finding *παρβασίαν*, 729, changed it to *παραβασίαν*, because he did not see any reason why he should write *κραδία* and *παρβασίαν* (forms unfamiliar to him), not knowing that there was any need for close metrical correspondence between strophe and antistrophe. In just the same way the copyist of Eur. *Heracle*. 529,

καὶ στεμματοῦτε καὶ κατέρχασθαι δοκεῖ,

did not see, not knowing the rule of the pause, why he should not make the construction simpler by writing

καὶ στεμματοῦτε καὶ κατέρχασθ' εἰ δοκεῖ.

Mr. Verrall has said nothing about the rule of the pause, but here too he would seem to revolt from the school of Porson, for in verse 13 he introduces a palpable violation of the great Cambridge scholar's law in reading,

ὄραν ἔχον θ' ἕκαστος ὥς τις συμπερεπής.

Mr. Verrall's critical method has undergone a considerable change—and certainly

a change in the right direction—since the appearance of his brilliant edition of the *Medea*. There he emends often brilliantly, but sometimes perhaps too boldly, guided chiefly by considerations of taste, metre, and language. Here his ‘corrections are chiefly in the division of the letters into words, and in the accentuation.’ Of these corrections the most striking are ἐκθέων for ἐκ θεῶν 23, οὐ κενὸς for οὐχ εἰς 100, φονῶν for φόνων 124, ἐκτὸς for ἐκτός 251, ἐπανδρὰς for ἐπ’ ἀνδρας 269, ὁδόν for ὁδόν 322, τῷ διαπτέσθαι for τῷδ’ ἰάπτεσθαι 531, θ’ ἐλόντος for θέλοντος 601, ἐξέξεσ’ ἂν γὰρ Οἰδίπου κατ’ εὗγματα for ἐξέξεσαν...κατεύγματα 696, Λαί’ οὐ for Λαίου 828, ἄγος for ἄγος 1008. The MS. reading is vindicated with uniform adroitness but varying degrees of cogency against a generally accepted emendation in the notes on γυνή σωτήρος 211, τὴν μακρὰν πάλιν μολεῖν, 600, συμφοίτω φρενῶν 648, ἐπ’ εὐναίᾳ χθονός 998, οὐ διατετίμηται 1038.

It would be tedious to give one’s own judgment on each of these corrections in detail. But one may perhaps make a comment on a few of them. ‘War in sallies’ would be very strangely expressed by πόλεμος ἐκθέων 23, and requires a stronger support than the remark that ἐκ θεῶν does not suit the character of the speaker (Eteocles). On οὐχ εἰς 100 is it not too bold to write ‘the MS. appears to me impossible; not one is no synonym for many’? In Latin it certainly is. One calls to mind at once Horace’s *consulque non unius anni*, and is not the usage whereby οὐχ εἰς = πολλοί almost explained in Eur. *Med.* 952,

εὐδαιμονήσει δ’ οὐχ ἐν ἀλλὰ μυρία,

and very nearly, if not exactly, paralleled by οὐχ ἓνα ῥυθμόν | κακῶν ἐχούσας, *Suppl.* 94, στεφάνων οὐ μία χορεία, *Cycl.* 517? Moreover the figure is a characteristic one in Greek. Just as οὐχ εἰς means ‘not merely one,’ so οὐκ ἴσην is ‘not merely even,’ that is ‘more than even’ in Soph. *O.* 7. 810, and οὐχ ὁμοία Thuc. i. 35 (quoted by Jebb) is ‘not merely similar,’ that is ‘more serious.’ The reading φονῶν 124 is an immense improvement. Mr. Verrall’s explanation of this passage is full of poetic feeling. For other passages characterized by robust and at the same time highly tasteful interpretation I would point especially to the strophe and antistrophe 332–355, and to the very difficult 670 ff. And I think he has rightly explained 611,

παρ’ ἀσπίδος γυμνωθὲν ἀρπάσαι δόρυ.

‘to seize the moment when the spear is uncovered by the shield.’

In 251 ἐκτὸς for ἐκτός seems impossible. If such a verbal existed in classical Greek it must have occurred oftener than once; and Mr. Verrall should at least have pointed to other places in which ἐκτός has usurped its place. Moreover, to get out from among the statues and go home, is the very course which Eteocles has urged on the maidens of the Chorus already more than once, for instance in 218,

σὸν δ’ αὖ τὸ σιγᾶν καὶ μένειν εἴσω δόμων.

The very ingenious reading ἐπανδρὰς 269 would seem at first sight to be discredited by the subsequent μολόν in 271; however, μολόν, like λαβόν, is often tacked on to a principal verb without exercising any real influence on the meaning of the passage. But ἐπανδρὰς is open to a much more serious criticism than this. Would Eteocles have undertaken to ‘run back again,’ as if he were a mere ἄγγελος? Would such a phrase be fitting in the mouth of an Aeschylean protagonist? Would it have been consistent with the dignity of Eteocles, and inoffensive to the taste of an Athenian audience?

As to 531,

ὥς πλείστ’ ἐπ’ ἀνδρὶ τῷδ’ ἰάπτεσθαι βελη,

it seems highly probable that this verse was inserted by some copyist or scholiast who thought that the φῶτα Καδμείων ἔνα borne by the Sphinx was a living Theban, and that the intention was to expose him to the darts of his Theban countrymen. But ὥς with the infinitive would signify *consequence*: so that the verse could only describe what was the *result* in the engagement of the use of this device. The interpolator forgot that the battle has not yet begun. It is absurd therefore to describe here the *effect* or *consequence* of the use of this device by Parthenopaeus. The verse should be expunged; every attempt to emend it is a failure.

There is no correction of Mr. Verrall’s which seems likely to command more unqualified assent than his view about the reading and meaning of 600, 601,

τείνουσι πομπὴν τὴν μακρὰν πάλιν μολεῖν,
Διὸς θ’ ἐλόντος συγκαθελκυσθήσεται,

‘They are bound on that journey whence ’tis an over-long way back, and he, when Zeus takes them, shall also be dragged down.’ Thus πάλιν of the Medicean is preserved, the infinitive μολεῖν depends on μακρὰν as an explanation, ‘long to return from,’ and there is no reason to assume with the later MSS. that τὴν μακρὰν πόλιν could refer to Hades.

I cannot help regarding συμφοίτω φρενῶν 648, ‘fellow-travellers-out-of-their-minds’ as

a grotesque way of expressing 'his mad pair of wanderers,' the figures of Right and the Warrior on the shield. If we met such a phrase in Aristophanes should we not regard φρεῶν as a case of παρὰ προσδοκίαν, and translate 'These comrades twain together going—mad'?

Of his conjectures proper, as we may call those in which, while adhering very closely to the MS. tradition, he however permits himself some latitude in the substitution of one letter for another, the most striking is his correction of οἵπερ τοῖς νέοις 1002, where from the note of the scholiast, 'This is imitated from

εἰς οἰωνὸς ἄριστος ἀμένεσθαι περὶ πάτρης,'

he restores

τέθηκεν οἷσπερ ὀρνέοις θνήσκειν καλόν,

a fine verse, and one well worthy of Aeschylus, if we could only be sure that ὀρνέον would be rightly used in the sense of *omen*. It is not safe to infer this from the fact that ὄρνις and οἰωνός mean *omen*. In matters of language Nomos is king, and his decrees are often as arbitrary as they are irreversible. It would be hard to give any reason why we always speak of an *eagle* eye, and an *aquiline* nose. A foreigner might not observe any impropriety of usage in

The Martyr first whose *aquiline* eye
Could pierce beyond the grave;

but we see that the substitution of *aquiline* for *eagle* makes the verse absurd. Can we be sure that ὄρνέον in the sense of *omen* would not have been ludicrous to an Athenian audience?

Strikingly ingenious is his view of the desperate passage 769 ff., where for κρείσσω τέκνον δ' ἀπ' ὀρμάτων he proposes χρυσοτέχνων πορμάτων, and advances a theory which gives a new and touching significance to σιδαρονόμφη χερί in the same context. In ἱρὸν ὄν μόγη for ἱρὸν εὐμενῇ 254 I cannot see that there is satisfactory evidence that the scholiast found μόγη in his text; his note reads rather as if he had μά before him. On 628, while fully agreeing with Mr. Verrall that πάγχυ qualifies the name Polynices, I would not with him change βία to βίη, but would regard Πολυδαίμωνος βία as a periphrasis for Πολυδαίμωνος, πάγχυ qualifying the periphrasis just as if it had been the simple name. The emendation which seems to rank in point of ingenuity and interest next to ὀρνέοις 1002 and ἐπαδὸς 269, is χηρώματα for χειρώματα 1013. It is hard to accept χηρώματα as meaning *mourners*, on the analogy of παιδείματα Eur. Hipp. 11, especially as χήρωμα is

not extant; but at all events Mr. Verrall has shown that τυμβοχόα χειρώματα has no meaning. We owe much gratitude to an editor for opening our eyes to the true character of a phrase in which we have carelessly acquiesced. If he has not restored the true reading, he has at least displaced the false.

Of the corrections put forward in the notes, but not introduced into the text, the best would seem to be καπηλεύσαιμ' ἐγώ for ἀληθεύσαιμ' ἐγώ on 549. There would thus be a characteristic allusion to the οὐ καπηλεύσειν μάχην in the preceding speech, and a play on the verb which in the answer of Eteocles would bear the meaning *to cheat*: 'and if the gods will, 'tis I will prove the cozeners.'

On 415, 416

οὐδὲ τὴν Διὸς

ἔριν πέδω σκήψασαν ἐμποδὼν σχεθεῖν

Mr. Verrall, objecting to the omission of the object of σχεθεῖν, the absence of ἄν, and 'the name Ἔριν, *Discord*, an inappropriate personage and not properly described as τὴν Διὸς,' proposes

ἐραὶ νῦν ἄν σκήψασαν ἐμποδὼν σχεθεῖν,

ἐραὶ being a locative related to ἐράζει as χαμαὶ is related to χαμάζει. But is any change necessary, except (perhaps) Dindorf's πέδοι! Τὴν Διὸς ἔριν means Δία ἐρίσαντα; ἐρίζειν is the word for a personal quarrel between two (διαστήτην ἐρίσαντε, Il. i. 6); the whole meaning is that not Zeus himself, if he made the quarrel his own, and came down and confronted Capaneus, would avail to check his course. If the object of σχεθεῖν and the conditional particle must be introduced, I would rather read,

ἔριν πέδοι σκήψασαν ἄν πόδα σχεθεῖν.

I doubt if there is ground for ascribing to Eteocles so much subtle irony, covert innuendo, and cultured scepticism, as Mr. Verrall is disposed to find in his utterances. Would so delicate a piece of embroidery have been wrought into a web so stout and even rough? Mr. Verrall recoils from anything which is commonplace; now there must in every play be some commonplace lines, and an editor may waste labour in seeking in such passages a deep and recondite meaning. This recoil from what is commonplace, and even from what is generally accepted, seconded by a very exceptional subtlety of mind, which often bears rich fruit in emendation and interpretation, sometimes leads him into surprising views about the meanings of

common words. Lord Tennyson in *Elaine* uses a strange metaphor,

As when we dwell upon a word we know,
Repeating, till the word we know so well
Becomes a wonder, and we know not why :

it must be some such state of mind as the poet contemplates in this passage, which leads Mr. Verrall to make *πόλισμα* in 233 mean a *revolution* or *roll*; or to hold that in 263 'there is a grim play...upon the two senses of *ἔσθήμασι* (*garments*) and *ἔσθήματα* *things put in* or *among* from *τίθημι*'; or in 259 to put into the mouth of Eteocles such a word as *οὔδατα*, Boeotian for *ῥδατα*, on the theory that 'the local form in the local name is a picturesque touch'; or to construe 577 f. so completely in defiance of the order of the words; or to take *Ἀχαιοὺ θεόθεν* together in 311 and explain 'of Achaean religion'; or to propose *πωρίζει* in *Choeph.* 927.

But Mr. Verrall's subtlety is so often the best of guides that we must not complain if it sometimes carries him too far. To be observant is one of the hall-marks of a scholar; and he is observant in the highest degree. And so great is his enthusiasm for letters, and so remarkable his brilliancy of style, that he never fails to awaken and hold the attention of his readers, and to quicken and refine their interest in the masterpieces of Ancient Literature.

ROBERT Y. TYRRELL.

Sophocles. The Plays and Fragments. Part II. The Oedipus Coloneus, with Critical Notes, Commentary, and Translation in English Prose, by R. C. JEBB, Doctor of Letters, Professor of Greek in the University of Glasgow, &c. Cambridge University Press, 1885. 12s. 6d.

THOUGH it is now some time since the appearance of Professor Jebb's second volume we are perhaps not too late to record with warm approbation the latest instalment of his important work. The reception which has been given to it discharges us from the necessity of general remarks; even if any general remark were applicable, except that it is careful and finished to the smallest detail, and that every page of it contains matter for careful reading.

Criticism must find subject-matter in what is debatable, and I propose to select for brief examination one or two of the places where examination may still be productive. Indeed Professor Jebb has nothing to lose by such a selection; for

nowhere does he better display his firm grasp of principle and singular clearness of exposition than where he draws the line round the field, *within* which search must be confined. In Greek grammar, especially in the grammar of Sophocles, it needs a clear head to apprehend the point at which seeming subtlety becomes real confusion. In this respect, Professor Jebb appears to me to have scarcely an equal among the commentators with whom I am acquainted; and the consequence is that, even where his conclusions may not satisfy, he is immensely helpful in disembarassing the problem.

We will take for the first example, *Oed. Col.* 9:

ἀλλ', ὦ τέκνον, θάκοισιν εἴ τινα βλέπεις
ἢ πρὸς βεβήλοισι ἢ πρὸς ἄλσεσιν θεῶν
στῆσόν με καὶ ξιδρύσον ὡς πυθοίμεθα
ὅπου ποτ' ἐσμέν· μαιθάνειν γὰρ ἤκομεν
ξένοι πρὸς ἀστῶν, ἃν δ' ἀκούσωμεν τελεῖν.

The editor accepts with the majority the corrections *θάκησιν* and *πυθώμεθα*: but he takes the pains to *show*, by a summary of the conditions under which a final sentence in the optative may follow a primary tense, that this example is not within those conditions. Both the classification and the conclusion are correct; and their value is in no way diminished, if we are nevertheless dissatisfied with the subjunctive, as we may be. For in the first place the assumed corruption is not of the commonest or most probable kind. It stands, for example, on a very different footing from the frequent *itacistic* confusion of *ηι*, *ει*, and even *οι*. But a more serious difficulty lies in the rendering of the text as emended: 'If thou seest any resting-place (*θάκησιν*), . . . stay me and set me down, that we may enquire where we are.' In this translation, what do we do with *ποτέ*? The addition of *ποτέ* to the interrogative has a regular and well-known force, roughly represented by the English *where in the world*? *ποῦ ποτ' εἰμί*; is the question of one completely lost. To take ready examples, Orestes in Euripides (*Or.* 215) returning to his senses after his fit, asks, *πόθεν ποτ' ἦλθον δαῖρο*; *πῶς δ' ἀφικόμην*; *ἀμνημονῶ γάρ*: and Heracles in the like circumstances (*Her. Fur.* 1105) *ποῦ ποτ' ὦν ἀμχανῶ*; But how could Oedipus and Antigone desire to put such a question? They are not in any sense *lost*. They do not indeed know the name of the village of Colonus; and Oedipus, being blind, does not know whether they are just now at a village or in the open country (*v.* 2): but they know perfectly well *ὅπου ποτ' εἰσί*, and indeed much more. They are on the road

to Athens, and have already been told, almost too often for Oedipus' patience, that they are in sight of the city (*v.* 25). Only Oedipus is too weary to proceed further, and desires, if there is a seat near, to be conducted to it at once, *whether it appears to be on sacred ground or profane*: and to this doubt refers the sole embarrassment which his words express. To such a situation the question *ποῦ ποτ' ἐσμέν*; is surely quite unsuitable. It would ask what they know, and would not ask what they want to know.

Again, as to *ἐξιδρύσων*? With the MS. reading *θάκοισιν*,¹ this word is a superfluous repetition of *θάκοισι στῆσον*, *place me in some seat*, and if, with the editor and others, we remove this fault by writing *θάκησιν*, then *στῆσον* itself becomes a difficulty, as is sufficiently apparent in his careful translation. Again, as to the preposition in *ἐξιδρύω*,—a compound which we should expect to mean 'seat me *away*,' or 'apart from,' or 'out of' something, as it does in the only other extant example.² Here also the editor clears the ground by dismissing the notion that we can supply 'from the road.' He himself treats *ἐξιδρύσων* as equivalent to *ἰδρύσων*, relying on the analogy of 'ἐξορθόω (to render *orthós*)'. This is perhaps conceivable; but *make me seated* is rather a cumbersome expression for *seat me*. Should we, apart from this passage, think it a likely form? For these reasons I think that the explanation is still to seek, and that we must start again from the position that *ὡς πνθοίμεθα* cannot be a final sentence; to which we must add that *ὅπου ποτ' ἐσμέν* cannot be a question depending on *πνθοίμεθα*. Of *ὅπου ποτ' ἐσμέν* there is but one other

possible construction: we must take it with *στῆσόν με θάκοισιν*—*put me in some seat, here wherever we are*, whether, that is to say, the place appears to be sacred or profane. But in that case *καὶ ἐξιδρύσων ὡς πνθοίμεθα* must be a parenthesis. I submit that it is, that *ἐξιδρύσων* (*τοῦ θάκου*) means 'remove me from this seat to another', and that *ὡς πνθοίμεθα* is not a final clause but *modal*, meaning 'according as we learn', *i.e.* 'according to the result of enquiry'. By a familiar kind of ellipse, 'remove me according to the result of enquiry' stands in Greek for 'remove me *or not* according to the result of enquiry', the alternative being understood. We have a parallel in Euripides *Med.* 330–331.

ΜΗ. φεῦ φεῦ, βροτοῖς ἔρωτες ὡς κακὸν μέγα.
ΚΡ. ὅπως ἂν, οἶμαι, καὶ παραστῶσιν τύχαι.

i.e. 'Love is a curse (or a blessing), according as fortune attends it', and see Eur. *Tro.* 1051. Now in general clauses of this kind the use of the optative (without *ἂν*) or of the subjunctive (usually with *ἂν*) is determined, in the more archaic syntax of the poets, not by the tense of the principal sentence at all, but by other considerations. The difference is not so easy to explain as to feel: but with the optative the event is more vaguely, remotely, and uncertainly conceived.³ Here therefore the optative, besides having the practical advantage *that the clause cannot be mistaken for a final clause*, is also right in feeling; since the pressing thought is the immediate need of repose, and the question of moving afterwards is relegated to a more distant plane. This effect is further aided by the parenthetic form of the clause; and for the same reason the locative *θάκοισιν* and the words *ὅπου ποτ' ἐσμέν* have the places of emphasis, these containing the essence of what is said. Logically *μανθάνειν γὰρ κ.τ.λ.* is connected with the parenthesis, to which there is no objection, since *γὰρ* does not, like the English *for*, make any close link with what immediately precedes, and is more accurately represented by *indeed*, or *you know*. Somewhat similar, though not precisely, is the arrangement in Eur. *Ale.* 472–475. In English, where parentheses are much more sparingly used, we should prefer a different arrangement; but for the present purpose we may perhaps render thus: 'My child, if thou seest any seat, whether on profane ground or by

¹ I take the construction to be *θάκοισι στῆσόν με, εἴ τινα* (*θάκου*) *βλέπεις*. The passage from the plural to the singular is natural and even necessary. The difference between *θάκος* and *θάκοι* (with singular meaning), where they differ, is that *θάκος* is the material *seat* or thing sat upon, as a *bench*, or *chair*, *θάκοι* a *sitting-place*, a seat considered generally or in the abstract. Here therefore the plural and the singular are each correctly used; *θάκῳ στῆσον* might have seemed to indicate a particular seat, and on the other hand *εἴ τινας βλέπεις* (since with *βλέπεις* the conception must be material) would have suggested a number of seats, which is not the intention. For the construction of the locative *θάκοισιν* compare *Oed. Tyr.* 29 *ἀγοραῖσι θακῇ*: it seems here to be indispensable, if *στῆσον* is not to be otiose; *στῆσόν με* could only mean 'stop me', which is surely the same thing as 'let me rest'.

² Eur. *fr.* 877, *τηλοῦ γὰρ οἴκων βίοντον ἐξιδρύσασσιν*, cited by the editor. He adds that there 'it is the context which fixes this sense.' This is true, and the passage certainly does not prove that *ἐξιδρύω* could bear no other. But it strengthens the presumption which the form itself suggests, that this is the natural meaning of it.

³ Kuehner, *Greek Grammar*, § 567, 6, quoting Aesch. *Eum.* 696, Soph. *Trach.* 94 *καὶ γὰρ ὕστερον τό γ' εἴ πρᾶσσειν, ἐπεὶ πύθοιτο, κέρδος ἐμπολῆ*, and other examples.

precinct of the gods, set me down—and remove me or not, as we may be told—in the place where we are, whatever it is. It is our duty' &c.

113. σὺ μ' ἐξ ὁδοῦ πόδα
κρύψον κατ' ἄλσος.

Professor Jebb marks ἐξ ὁδοῦ πόδα as an error. In a careful note he shows, that neither (1) the σχῆμα καθ' ὅλον καὶ μέρος ('hide me,—that is my foot'), nor (2) the compound verb (κρύψον-πόδα με) is of any use here, both involving the assumption that κρύπτειν πόδα could mean 'to *guide* another's steps to a hiding-place'; and (3) that πόδα cannot be dismissed as 'redundant'. He mentions and properly disapproves the proposed emendations, regarding as 'probable' H. Keck's ἐκποδῶν ὁδοῦ, but this of course only as a counsel of despair. It is perhaps worth asking, whether ποὺς may not have been used, in colloquial phrases, as an equivalent for βάσις (*foot* for *foot-step*), and whether πόδα in that sense may not here be an accusative of *space*—'hide me in the grove *a step off the road*'. That this is what Oedipus means, and what is actually done, is shown by his prompt re-appearance. Something near to such a use of ποὺς is implied by the phrase βαίνειν πόδα; for it is not easy to accept the explanation, that in this 'βαίνω is transitive'. Why should it admit a transitive use in this particular phrase, and not elsewhere? Neither is βαίνειν πόδα merely a synonym for βαίνειν: in the case cited by Professor Jebb, for instance, Eur. *El.* 1173,

ἀλλ' οἶδε μητρὸς νεοφόνους ἐν αἵμασιν
πεφυρμένοι βαίνουσιν ἐξ οἴκων πόδα,

in the word πόδα lies the whole force of the description. It belongs to πεφυρμένοι as much or more than to βαίνουσιν, the point being that the *feet* of the slayers are stained with the blood of their victim, and that as they *step* from the house they print a trace of their deed.

In *Alc.* 1153, ἀλλ' εὐτυχόης νόστιμον δ' ἔλθοις πόδα (where γρ.δόμον and γρ.καὶ ὁδὸν seem to be rather conjectures than various readings), it may be doubted whether πόδα refers to the 'foot' of the traveller at all, and not rather to the termination of his journey. The comparison of the journey out and the journey back to the two 'legs' (κῶλα) of the δίαυλος (*Aesch. Ag.* 334, Eur. *Med.* 1181) may well have furnished colloquial language with the expression νόστιμος ποὺς for the arrival at home.

433.

οὐ δῆτ', ἐπεὶ τοι τὴν μὲν αὐτίχ' ἡμέραι
ὀπήνικ' ἔξει θυμὸς ἡδιστον δέ μοι
τὸ κατθανεῖν ἦν καὶ τὸ λευσθῆναι πέτροις,
οὐδεὶς ἔρωτος τοῦδ' ἐφαίνεται ὠφελῶν.
χρόνῳ δ' ὅτ' ἤδη πᾶς ὁ μόχθος ἦν πέπων,
κάμάνθανον τὸν θυμὸν ἐκδραμόντα μοι
μείζω κολαστὴν τῶν πρὶν ἡμαρτημένων,
τὸ τήνικ' ἤδη κ.τ.λ.

Two points may be noticed here :

(1) ἔρωτος τοῦδε—ἔρωτ' ἐς τόνδε Pappageorgius, Jebb. Here again the editor, who discusses the passage elaborately in the appendix, is singularly neat and decisive in cutting the roots of fallacious explanations. Such are (1) that ὠφελῶν is regarded as a substantive, *helper*, on the analogy of ἡ τεκοῦσά τινος and other such phrases '*expressing a familiar relationship*'. Where, he asks, do we find οὐδεὶς ἦν φιλῶν τοῦ ἀνδρὸς or the like? (2) that the passive ὠφελείσθαι τινος, *to benefit by a thing*, justifies the active: ὄνασθαι τινος is good; but ὀνίνημί τινά τινος? (3) that ὠφελῶν is ὠφέλημα παρέχων, on which principle, as he says, we might justify γραμματικῆς διδάσκων for 'teaching grammar'. Neither is he to be put off with a genitive of 'respect' or 'connexion'. If these phrases will cover ὠφελῶν ἔρωτος, the genitive has no limits at all. The change which he accepts is very slight,¹ and in construction simple. It is open, however, to a slight objection, which applies also to the rejected explanations. The words ἔρωτ' ἐς τόνδε are superfluous and, unless an awkward emphasis is thrown on ἔρωτα, add nothing to the point, which is to contrast the conduct of the sons *at one time* with their conduct *at another*. Has it ever been considered whether ἔρωτος τοῦδε may be a genitive *absolute*, 'when this was my desire'? The words seem to be capable of this meaning, and it is effective as a resumption of the clause ὀπήνικ' . . . πέτροις. If ἔρωτος is a predicate the emphasis falls on it naturally.

(2) μείζω κολαστὴν: 'too great a chastiser', i.e. 'too severe', is the editor's explanation, relying on Eur. *Med.* 549, μέγας φίλος, 'a staunch friend'. But the support is untrustworthy, for μέγας φίλος there can perfectly well have its proper sense 'a powerful friend'; and the possibility of the other interpretation must be proved *aliunde*. The

¹ The assumed corruption is not, however, very natural: ἔρωτες might well be changed to ἔρωτος, 'and the change of τόνδε to τοῦδε would follow'. Why so? ἔρωτος τόνδε is not *obviously* inexplicable, for τόνδε might stand for με: and a corrector, if we suppose *deliberate* change, would have devised something easier than ἔρωτος τοῦδε.

meaning given by the editor here is no doubt correct in substance, but I submit that it is not *κολαστήν* which makes possible the use of *μέγας*, but *θυμόν*, and that to *θυμόν* in strict analysis *μείζω* belongs, being joined as a further predicate with *ἐκδραμόντα*. In fact the editor's translation 'that my wrath *had run too far* in punishing those past errors' seems to me precisely right, and more so than his note. The phrase *μέγας θυμός*, *high anger*, is familiar.

Space forbids me to go further at present in discussion: and it would be impossible even to sample here the notes which seem to dispose finally of their subject. I have noted for example as containing points of special interest, those *vv.* 342, 383, 420, 504, 522, 658, and many others. But it is useless to distinguish, where the whole deserves accurate study. I hope for an opportunity of returning to the subject.¹

A. W. VERRALL.

M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammatum Libri.
Mit erklärenden Anmerkungen von LUDWIG
FRIEDLÄNDER, Professor in Königsberg.
Leipzig, S. Hirzel. vol. i pp. (4) and 523,
vol. ii pp. 546. 18 M.

THIS book has long been impatiently expected. Prof. Friedländer's Sittengeschichte is itself a commentary on Martial and his times, and since Marquardt's death probably no one remains, unless it is Mommsen, equally familiar with the life and manners of the Roman empire.

English readers will read with interest the dedication 'dem Andenken an Hugh Andrew Johnstone Munro † 30 März 1885.' Since 1878 Munro and Friedländer had carried on a correspondence about Martial (i p. 125):

'Munro hat stets an meiner Arbeit den freundlichsten Antheil genommen und mir eine Reihe trefflicher

eigener Emendationen und auch einige interessante Conjekturen anderer Gelehrter in Cambridge mitgetheilt. Die Nachricht von seinem nach kurzer Krankheit in Rom am 30 März d. J. erfolgten Tode war für mich eine überaus schmerzliche.'

The introduction is divided into five chapters:

I (pp. 3-26). Martial's life and poems.

II (pp. 26-50). Martial's versification. (The chief part of this chapter, 'Elegisches Distichon,' is by Th. Birt, whose shortening of *o* in the substantive *modo*, x 16 8, calls forth a deserved protest from the *Revue Critique*.)

III (pp. 50-67). 'Chronology of Martial's Epigrams.' Here Friedländer has modified his earlier results by the aid of Stobbe, Mommsen, Hirschfeld, Asbach, Kerekhoff.

IV (pp. 67-119). 'Tradition of the Text,' with three appendices: (1) 'Derivation of the Three Families from Three Texts.' (2) 'On Cod. F and the MSS. identified with it by Schneidewin' (by C. Froben). (3) 'Orthographical Details' (by W. Gilbert). Many scholars have contributed collations, and Friedländer has worked hand in hand with Gilbert, whose edition of the text has just been published by Teubner, and whose review in the *Berliner Philolog. Wochenschr.* 4 Dec. 1886, enters into some detail about Friedländer's critical treatment of his materials. The orthography generally coincides with that sanctioned by the oldest MSS. of other authors; it is to be observed that both Friedländer and Gilbert write *epistola*, *brachium*.

V (pp. 120-127). 'Editions.' It is to be regretted that more use has not been made of Rader's commentary, which is often cited, for instance, by Becker in his *Gallus*. Marcilius and Heraldus are not even mentioned, though both of them did much to illustrate the language and the matter of their author. The names of masters in various departments of ancient learning, whom Prof. Friedländer has been able to consult on difficult points, Jordan, G. and O. Hirschfeld, P. Krüger, V. Hehn, F. Hultsch, C. F. W. Müller, A. Sallet, F. Schürer, suffice to assure us that nothing has been omitted to make Martial intelligible to this age. For the text, beside Gilbert and Munro, and collators, Baehrens, Bucheler, Grasberger, Rohde, have supplied contributions.

There are special introductions to *spect.* and XIV. The commentary is divided into four sections: (1) Critical notes (only where the reading is doubtful: it would be well to publish the entire variations of the important

¹ At v. 71 by a slip of the pen 'The Chorus are' is written for 'The Stranger is.' *A propos* of this, is not the *ΞΕΝΟΣ* of the traditional *dramatis personae* a singularly unhappy description! Oedipus addresses him of course by *ὁ ξένε*, but I can scarcely believe that Sophocles meant him to be so described. Could Antigone when she sees him approaching (*v.* 29) possibly have said *πέλας γὰρ ξένον τόνδε νῦν ὁπῶ* instead of *ἄνδρα*? Yet to describe him as *ξένος* in the *dramatis personae* is much the same thing. The word is essentially relative, and has no meaning as an independent description. 'Ἄνθρωπος Κολακιάτης' would be the proper phrase. Polynices at his approach (*v.* 1249) is described as *ὁ ξένος*, but naturally, as he is known to be such, *ἐμπολεῖ σὺν ὅπῃ, συγγενῇ δέ*, *v.* 1156.

MSS. collated for the first time). (2) Dr. E. Wagner's parallels from earlier and later writers. (3) Citations in grammarians, scholiasts and mediaeval writers. (4) Explanatory notes.

At the end is an index of names by Carl Froben (pp. 347-381), divided into mythological, geographical and topographical, authors, historical persons before the battle of Actium, Roman emperors, real (in *italies*) and fictitious names of the imperial times, names of animals. A full index of words (pp. 382-532) and an index to the introduction and notes complete the book. The index of words is an improvement on the Delphin index, for under the adjectives the substantives with which they agree are given. But it does not supersede Lemaire's index of phrases; both are necessary to the student. By referring to his *Sittengeschichte*, to Becker-Göll's *Gallus*, to Marquardt's and Mommsen's handbooks and other standard authorities, Friedländer has been able to compress much valuable teaching in a small compass. I hope elsewhere to furnish larger materials for the interpretation of the prince of epigrammatists. Here space will allow only a few extracts from my collections.

III 18

perfrixisse tuas questa est praefatio fauces.
cum te excusaris, Maxime, quid recitas?

Suet. Nero 41 *edictis tandem Vindicis contumeliosis et frequentibus permotus, senatum epistula in ultionem sui rei que publicae adhortatus est, excusato languore faucium propter quem non adesset*. Quintil. iv 1 § 8. Tac. d. 20 pr. *quis nunc feret oratorem de infirmitate valetudinis praefantem? qualia sunt ferme principia Corvini*. Gellius xi 9 § 1.

III 23

omnia cum retro pueris opsonia tradas,
cur non mensa tibi ponitur a pedibus?

Sen. ep. 77 § 8 *non esse inhumanum, quemadmodum cena peracta reliquiae circumstantibus dividantur, sic peracta vita aliquid porrigi his, qui totius vitae ministri fuissent*. Petron. 67 'Narra mihi, Gai, oro, Fortunata quare non recumbit?' 'Quomodo nosti' inquit 'illam,' Trimalchio, 'nisi argentum composuerit, nisi reliquias pueris dividerit, aquam in os suum non coniciet.' Suet. Galba 22 *cibi plurimi traditur, quem tempore hiberno etiam ante lucem capere consuevit, inter cenam vero usque eo abundantis, ut congestas super manus reliquias circumferri*

iuberet spargique ad pedes stantibus. cf. Phaedrus i 22 6.

III 75 3 bulbique salaces. Athen. ii 64 and 65 p. 63^d seq. who cites the proverb οὐδέν σ' ὀνήσει βολβὸς ἂν μὴ ρεύρ' ἔχῃς. Apic. vii 12.

IV 86 9 10

si damnaverit, ad salariorum
curras serinia protinus licebit.

From Catullus 14 17 18 *nam si luxerit, ad librariorum curram serinia*.

IV 89 1 ohe iam satis est, ohe, libelle. See on the change of quantity Munro on Lucretius iv 1259 and Nicander, frag. 70 14 ἴσον ἴσῳ.

V 69 7 8

quid prosunt sacrae pretiosa silentia linguae?
incipient omnes pro Cicerone loqui.

From Sextilius Ena in Sen. suas. 6 § 27 *deplendus Cicero est Latinaeque silentia linguae*.

VIII 30 6 totis pascitur illa sacris.

This is said of the right hand of the convict who represented Scaevola, thrusting his hand into the fires of the altar. Friedländer conjectures *sacris p. i. focis*: 'totis was written *focis*, and then the transposition was made for the metre.' Duff and Munro explain *totis* adverbially 'dextra unice pascitur et delectatur sacrificiis.' I take it in its strict sense: the hand does not timidly skirt the fringe of the fire, letting 'I dare not' wait upon 'I would,' but plunges into the thick of it and there roams, devouring the devouring element, like a beast in its pasture; 'feeds on the length and breadth of the burnt-offering.' *Sacris focis* is very tame in comparison.

VIII 76 7 vero verius ergo quid sit, audi. cf. vi 30 6 *vis dicam tibi veriora veris?*

Sen. ep. 66 § 8 *nihil invenies rectius recto, non magis quam verius vero, quam temperato temperatius*. Paulin. vit. Amb. 25 certo certius. Arnob. ii 48 *omni vero verissimum, est certoque certissimum* (on the abl. after superl. see Bernays *Ges. Abh.* ii 128).

IX 87 4 5

et dicis 'modo liberum esse iussi
Nastam.'

Flor. i 10 § 8 *valere liberosque esse iussit*. Manumission *per epistulam*, cod. vii 6 1 § 1c.

X 3 3 4

quae sulphurato nolit empta ramento
Vatiniorum proxeneta fractorum.

Sen. n.q. i 1 § 8 *nam apud nos quoque ramenta sulphure aspersa ignem ex intervallo trahunt*.

X 25 5 6

nam cum dicatur tunica praesente molesta
'ure manum' plus est dicere 'non facio.'

The use of the present deserves to be illustrated.

Plaut. trin. 1059 CH. *heus tu, asta ilico. audi, heus tu.* ST. non sto.—most. 251 (= 261 R) PH. *tum tu igitur cedo purpurissum.* SC. non do. 862-3 *velut ubi aduersum ut eant ero suo vocantur:* | 'non eo: molestus ne sis.'—CURC. 621 PHAEDR. *ambula in ius.* THER. non eo. 662 PHAEDR. *tace tu.* CURC. non taceo. 712-3 CAPP. *non taces?* THER. non taceo.—Ter. haut. 610-1 CH. *pro Menedemo nunc tibi ego respondeo* | 'non emo.'—Sen. contr. 27 § 14 'caede' inquit: 'non caedo.' *verbera:* 'non ferio.'—Passio Perpetuae et Felicitatis 2 'fac sacrum pro salute imperatorum.' et ego respondi: 'non facio.'—Cypriani acta proconsul. 3 (in Hartel's Cypr. p. cxii. = Aug. serm. 309) *Galerius Maximus proconsul dixit:* 'iusserunt te sacratissimi imperatores caeremoniari.' *Cyprianus episcopus dixit:* 'non facio.' cf. Cypr. p. 483 17 = 660 19. Acta Felicis c. 2 § 2 (in Dupin's Optatus, 149 col. 2) *Magnilianus curator dixit:* 'Felix episcopo, da libros vel membranas quascunque habes.' *Felix episcopus dixit:* habeo, sed non do' (same reply *ibid.* c. 5 p. 150 col. 2). Ruinart acta sincera (Pionius c. 21, but in c. 8 the future is used). acta sanct. Feb. 1 p. 46^d. Le Blant, Les Actes des Martyrs p. 81.

XIV 151

dulci sed pondere venter

si tumeat.

Ov. her. 11 37 *iamque tumescebant vitiati pondera ventris.* Rittershusius and others on Phaedrus III 15. *lexx. s.v. pondus.*

XIV 174 2 cetera matris habet.

Cf. ii 89 4 hoc Ciceronis habes. *ibid.* 2 and 6.

XIV 212

si solum species hominis caput, Hectora credas:

si stantem videas, Astyanacta putes.

Iuv. vi 503-4 *Andromachen a fronte videbis.* | post minor est, credas aliam.

XIV 217 1 die quotus et quanti cupias cenare. See Obbarius on Hor. ep. 1 5 30 *tu, quotus esse velis, reseribe.*

XIV 218

non tantum calamis, sed cantu fallitur ales,
callida dum tacita crescit harundo manu.

On the fowler's lined rod see Zacher in Hermes xix 432-436 with the supplement of O. Crusius *ibid.* xxi 487-490. Most of

my collections have been anticipated by one or other of these papers, but I believe that no one has called attention to a graphic description in Aug. de magistro c. 10 § 32 *nam quaero abs te, si quisquam ignarus deceptionis avium, quae calamis et visco affectatur, obviam fieret aucupi, armis quidem suis instructo, non tamen aucupanti, sed iter agenti; quo viso premeret gradum secumque, ut fit, admirans cogitaret et quaereret quidnam sibi hominis ille vellet ornatus; auceps autem cum in se videret attentum, ostentandi se studio cannas expediret et prope animadversam aliquam aviculam fistula et accipitre figeret, subigeret et caperet; nonne illum spectatorem suum doceret nullo significatu, sed re ipsa, quod ille scire cupiebat?*

In a word: this edition is indispensable for all students of Martial, containing a greatly enlarged and sifted critical apparatus, a concise antiquarian commentary, such as probably no other living man could have given us, a large collection of parallel passages, and occasionally valuable grammatical and lexicographical notes. There is still room for a young Ruhnken or Heindorf to labour in this last field, and the commentators on Horace (esp. Obbarius), Apuleius, Petronius, with Casaubon's Persius and Suetonius, will supply abundant materials and models of research.

JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

The Development of the Athenian Democracy.

By F. B. JEVONS, M.A., Tutor in the University of Durham.

THIS pamphlet is an attempt to elucidate some of the obscurities of early Athenian history, and to explain, on the basis of historical development, how political power passed from the Eupatridae into the hands of the $\pi\lambda\eta\theta\omicron\varsigma$.

Mr. Jevons attacks his subject with two different weapons. The first of these is the recently discovered papyrus-fragment of Aristotle's $\pi\omicron\lambda\iota\tau\iota\alpha$ $\text{'A}\theta\eta\eta\alpha\iota\omicron\nu$: the second is the close application of the 'comparative method,' in order to investigate the interdependence of ancient religious and political systems. Mr. Jevons is surely mistaken in thinking (p. 27) that he is the first to apply this method to Athenian political development. Not to mention Freeman's *Lectures on Comparative Politics*, La Cité Antique of Fustel de Coulanges is entirely based on this idea.

It is well known that in 683 B.C. a step in the direction of democracy was made by the institution of nine annual archons. The

competition for the office, then practically the sole depositary of power, was very keen. It appears from the papyrus that in the archonship of a certain Damasias, whose date Mr. Jevons, following Bergk¹ (*Rhein. Mus.* 1881, p. 87 ff.), places at 639–8 B.C., an outbreak of violence occurred which resulted in the division of the archonate between the three 'classes' in such a way that the Eupatridae were represented by four archons, the Geomori (Georgi, Apoiki) by three, and the Demiurgi by two. Here a difficulty at once arises, because the historians tell us that it was not till half a century after B.C. 639 that Solon instituted his property classification, admitting only the first class to office. This would be, if anything, a retrograde step, since obviously fewer Geomori and Demiurgi than before would be eligible to office. Mr. Jevons shows that the view that only the πεντακοσιομέδιμνοι were eligible to office under Solon rests solely on a passage of Plutarch (*Aristides* i.), on other grounds suspicious, and concludes, with the support of Aristotle (*Pol.* ii. 12), that by the constitution of Solon all ἀρχαὶ were held by the first three property classes. It may be added that the negative evidence of Pollux viii. 131 (οἱ δὲ τὸ θητικὸν τελοῦντες οὐδεμίαν ἀρχὴν ἤρχον) and of Harpocration s.v. θῆτες (οὗτοι δὲ οὐδεμίαν ἤρχον ἀρχὴν) tell in the same direction.

Then follows an ingenious piece of reasoning, which contains the gist of the paper. Proceeding on the assumption (previously laid down by Oncken, *Staatslehre des Aristoteles*) that when Aristotle speaks in abstract terms about the development of political institutions he is really referring to those of Athens, the author argues that Aristotle's well-known Four Stages of the evolution of democracy (*Pol.* vi. (iv.) 4–6) do in fact exactly correspond to what actually occurred in the history of Athens. The First Stage, in which the depositary of power is τὸ γεωργικὸν καὶ τὸ κεκτημένον μετρίαν οὐσίαν, corresponds to the pre-Solonian period. The Second Stage, when the suffragē without restriction belongs to all ἀνυπεύθυνοι κατὰ τὸ γένος, answers to the Reforms of Solon. The Third Stage, τὸ πᾶσιν ἐξεῖναι ὅσοι ἂν ἐλεύθεροι ᾖσι, reflects the Reforms of Cleisthenes, under whom the term ἐλεύθεροι assumed a new and wider meaning. The Fourth Stage, when voters are paid by the State for their services, τοὺς ἀπόρους λαμβάνειν μισ-

θὸν, admittedly stands for the Periclean Reforms.

Mr. Jevons bases his arguments on the cardinal fact that admission to the φρατρία meant possession of the franchise. The πλῆθος at Athens, like its analogue, the plebs at Rome, wanted power, and was determined to make itself unpleasant until it obtained it. Now power, i.e. the right of choosing your rulers and holding them to account, was only held by members of the φρατρίαί, which φρατρίαί were made up of a certain number of γένη. Belong to a γένος the πλῆθος could not, any more than the plebs at Rome could be admitted to a patrician's household rites. The problem could only be solved, as indeed it was solved at Rome, by admitting the πλῆθος into the φρατρίαί but not into the γένη of which the φρατρίαί were composed. This revolution was accomplished before Solon, possibly soon after what was practically the monarchy was subdivided, just as at Rome the plebs forced their way into the *Comitia Centuriata* soon after the bisection of the regal power. But, in order not to make a complete surrender, the Eupatridae probably accompanied their concession to the πλῆθος with a timocratic restriction of the franchise, such as is described by Aristotle in his First Stage, and this was in force when Solon instituted his reforms. Solon extended the franchise to all members of φρατρίαί, without any restrictions of property, but, in order to check indiscriminate admission, he denied the right of inheritance in intestacy (ἀγχιστέα), and therefore the franchise, to νόθοι, i.e. to children of non-Athenians by either parent.

Cleisthenes introduced manhood suffrage for Attica. The φρατρία, as a division carrying political privileges, was abolished, and a geographical subdivision of Attica into δῆμοι substituted, the right of πολιτεία being henceforth dependent on registration as δημότης not as φράτωρ. This was manhood suffrage, with one restriction, that the father must be an Athenian. No proof is at hand that Cleisthenes was the author of this law, but it is obvious that some check must have been introduced, and Mr. Jevons points out that if the πολίτης still had to be γνήσιος ἐξ ἀμφοῖν, Cimon, Themistocles, and Thucydides (*Olori*), all νόθοι *e peregrinīs*, would have been ἄτιμοι.

The φρατρία, killed by Cleisthenes, was revived by Pericles. This was the effect of the law μόνους Ἀθηναίους εἶναι τοὺς ἐκ δυεῖν Ἀθηναίων γεγονότας (*Plut. Per.* 37), a law rendered a State necessity by Pericles' new

¹ Mr. Jevons makes too little use of this admirable paper. He takes his readings of the papyrus from the completely superseded interpretation of Blass, *Hermes*, 1880, p. 336 f.; 1881, p. 42 f.

arrangement for giving pay for attendance at the ἐκκλησία. This new arrangement, dangerous to finance if open to any casual applicant, had the double effect of restoring the φρατρία as a political qualification, and of drawing together in a closer bond of union all true-born Athenians.

The weak link in this chain of practically rewritten history appears to be the period of the Solonian and pre-Solonian Reforms. According to Mr. Jevons Solon abolished the property qualification for the exercise of the franchise. This involves two assumptions: (1) that when, in 639, the archonate was divided amongst the three classes, the franchise depended on a property qualification, and (2) that, granted a property qualification to the franchise was made, it lasted up to Solon's time. Neither assumption rests on a shadow of evidence. Gilbert indeed (*Griech. Staatsalt.* i. 123), whom Mr. Jevons is perhaps following, suggests that the concession of 639 meant 'ein wohl mit einer vermögensrechtlichen Beschränkung verbundenes Wahlrecht,' but he advances no proof of the assumption, nor does Mr. Jevons, except the comparison of what happened at Rome. Again, the words of the papyrus-fragment itself, immediately following the account of the breaking up of the archonate, seem to show that the arrangement was purely temporary. It continues καὶ οἱ τοὶ τὸν μετὰ Δαμαρίαν ἥρ[ξαν ἐν] αὐτὸν, which surely implies that the change terminated with that year. It was a change hastily made, to meet the demands of tumult, and as hastily revoked. And it is clear that it is quite unnecessary to assume any elaborate timocratic restriction of the franchise if the right to exercise it only lasted one year. Besides, this breaking up of the archonate was a reform of an ultra-democratic character, too democratic for its early date. It was the institution of plebeian magistrates. And if it lasted from 639 to 594, it seems impossible that we should not have heard more of it, either by direct historical record, or by the indirect evidence of democratic reforms carried during those forty-five years. The five Georgic and Demiurgic archons must have made a very bad use of their time if they failed to carry against their four Eupatrid brethren nothing more than the legal reforms of Draco. Nor is it easy to see how the author of (Arist.) *Pol.* ii. 8, could have called such a constitution ἀριστοκρατία λίαν ἀσφατος.

One or two minor points remain which seem open to criticism. It is stated (p. 23) that 'in B.C. 411 the total number of citizens

[of Athens] probably did not amount to more than the 5,000 citizens to whom the ἐκκλησία was limited.' Then what was the point of the Four Hundred limiting the citizenship to five thousand? They obviously intended to re-impose some timocratic qualification (Thuc. viii. 65, end), to the exclusion of the poorer classes. The reason given (on p. 24) for the conclusion of the 'Thirty Years' Truce by Athens (that it was to gain time for preparation for the inevitable war with Sparta) looks like a piece of rather loose writing, and sounds much as though it had been said that in 1871 the French made peace in order to prepare for the inevitable war with Germany. Is it not rather 'hard luck,' too, to say (p. 27) that the whole of Curtius' account of the Cleisthenean reforms is 'vitiating by a fundamental error' because he, amongst other mistakes, was not acquainted with a fact recorded only in the Berlin papyrus, which was not discovered till more than twenty years after Curtius wrote his *History*? The quotation from Herodotus vii. 2, is rather a slender peg on which to hang the 'primacy of the eldest son' among the Greeks, for that passage plainly refers, not to the headship of a family, but succession to a throne, by no means the same thing. Finally, the word φρατρία is regarded (p. 31) as 'a later form of φατρία, which is an Ionic weakening of πατρία a by-form of πάτρα: thus φρατρία is the association of sons of a common father.' Would not the received connexion of φρατρία with Sans. *bhrātā*, Lat. *frater*, have been a simpler way of arriving at the same result? Curtius (*Gk. Etym.* 699) deals with the form φατρία.

On the whole, however, although we are not prepared to accept in its entirety this complete remodelling (for it is nothing less) of much of the early Attic history, yet the author deserves the gratitude of all students of comparative politics for his bold and lucid attempt, from which no one could fail to derive instruction, to grapple with a most difficult and perplexing problem.

A. H. COOKE.

Römische Geschichte. Von THEODOR MOMMSEN.
Fünfter Band. Die Provinzen von Caesar bis
Dioletian. Berlin. Weidmann. 1885. 9 M.

It is thirty years since Dr. Mommsen published the third volume of his *Roman History*. He has at last given us out of its proper order vol. v. The reason for the delay and the change of order hang together. The interval has been largely occupied with

the editing of the *Corpus Inscr. Lat.*, and the present volume is the first-fruits for general readers of that laborious but fruitful task. Without it no such clear and definite account of the provinces could have been produced, and even with its help there is probably no one else who unites sufficient detailed knowledge of the provinces with a mastery of the imperial history as a whole, to have guided us through evidence so intricate into so clear a view of the subject. A chronological history of the Provincial governments indeed we must not look for here, nor do the available authorities suffice for such a work. The historians of the Empire rarely rose above the level of court-chroniclers; above all they never realised how the living development of the Empire was shifting from the centre to the circumference. Their allusions therefore to the provinces are scattered and fragmentary, and even such writers as Strabo or the elder Pliny do not as a rule give us exactly the information that we most want. Still some sort of picture, though vague and blurred at the best, may be drawn of the Empire from the collective testimony of the classical writers. We get from them an impression, if no more, that the provinces during the first two centuries were on the whole flourishing, some of them indeed as they have never been either before or since, that their administration was efficient and continuous, and their Romanisation in many cases complete. But it is only by collecting scattered notices and allusions, as well from the 'Texts' as from the often more valuable evidence of inscriptions, coins, and archaeology, that we are enabled, and that incompletely, to fill up this picture, to verify this impression, and to trace the steps and stages of the development of the Empire. This then is Dr. Mommsen's aim. The work of the first three centuries was the ingathering of foreign elements into the Graeco-Roman civilisation. The necessary condition for this was the 'pax Romana,' which again was dependent on the frontier defences of the Empire. The volume therefore naturally falls into two main divisions. Chapters i., iv., v., vi. and ix. give a chronological account of the frontier policy along the great barriers of the Rhine, Danube, and Euphrates, and the relations with barbarian tribes which shaped or resulted from that policy. The other chapters deal rather with the inner development in civilisation, commerce, administration, and literature, which was going on meanwhile behind the iron barriers of the legionary camps.

The foundation of the frontier policy in the West as laid down by Augustus is

described in chapter i. Italy received for the first time a definite boundary, being protected from barbarian tribes and separated from the great military commands by a girdle of small procuratorial provinces reaching from the Maritime Alps to Noricum. Through these provinces ran the great military roads which connected Italy both with Gaul and the armies of the Rhine, but they were not themselves garrisoned with legionary troops till the time of Marcus Aurelius. Towards the Danube the vaguely-bounded and loosely-administered Illyricum was replaced by three military provinces, Pannonia, Dalmatia, and Moesia, and the great river, from Carnuntum to its mouth, became the political, though not at once the military, boundary of the Empire. On the Rhine the policy of Augustus was less bold, perhaps, as Dr. Mommsen inclines to think, less really prudent. At least, it was influenced more by internal and financial considerations than by military and imperial interests. For years the country up to the Elbe had practically been occupied by Roman legions, and even Roman law and administration were being introduced, when the whole policy of the Empire, superintended as it had been for nearly twenty years by members of the imperial family, was altered apparently in consequence of a single military disaster. In a sense no doubt this step was 'a turning-point in the fate of nations,' but its effects were hardly felt for the first two centuries. Indeed the forward policy was to a certain extent renewed in Upper Germany by Domitian and Trajan, a proceeding on which further light may be thrown when some German 'Bruce' makes the German *times* tell its tale. The chapter on the Danubian provinces is perhaps the most interesting in the book. This was the critical point of the Empire, and as the German armies after the first century were diminished, so those of the Danube were continually being increased. It was here that the Augustan policy was for the first time modified by Trajan's annexation of Dacia, here too that Marcus Aurelius, had he lived, would have supported this outlying province by Marcomannia, in place of the shattered *regnum Fannianum*, and Sarmatia in the valley of the Theiss. Whether this policy would have saved the Empire from the Gothic wars is perhaps a vain speculation: at least, when the Illyrian emperors replaced anarchy by order, it was proved that the 'Roman state could still only be broken by itself.'

On the eastern frontier Rome, since the

time of Pompey, was face to face with a great power, and here, more than on the other frontiers, the policy of buffer-states was pursued. Of these the most important was Great Armenia, and Dr. Mommsen points out more clearly than has ever been done before how the relations of Rome with Parthia hinged on Armenian affairs. There were three possible courses to adopt, 'to annex it to the Empire, to relinquish it to Parthia, or to make it a client state. Augustus, too cautious for the first, too mindful of Roman prestige for the second, adopted the middle course. The result was continual friction, and more than once actual war with Parthia. Nero's government, considering perhaps that prestige was sufficiently saved by Corbulo's campaigns, adopted the second, insisting only on a nominal suzerainty for Rome. Trajan characteristically took the bolder course, and not only annexed Armenia, but by extending the frontier to the Tigris, brought it completely within the Empire. This, in spite of Hadrian's withdrawal and occasional disaster, remained the Roman policy henceforward, and on the whole was justified by its results.

Of the more complex contents of the other chapters it is possible in a short notice to glance at one or two points only. Of special interest is the treatment of the various forms assumed by the municipal constitutions established in the various parts of the Empire. Gaul with its large tribal communities still existing, but centering round their principal town or *civitas*, Spain with a separate town-constitution for each small canton, Africa with its towns of Punic constitution, Asia and Syria with their Macedonian creations, retaining still their Hellenic government, Greece with its numerous gradations of civic autonomy, helpless before a stroke of the proconsul's pen, and lastly, the *coloniae* and *municipia* gradually scattered over the whole Empire—all form a striking example of unity of administration amid diversity of detail. The various native languages again received as a rule similar treatment from the government, though local circumstances gave them different histories. Thus, while all were restricted to private intercourse, the Thracian disappeared, the Celtic, Iberian and Illyrian retreated to mountainous corners, the Berber and Egyptian remained in general use outside the towns, while to the Aramaic even a literary importance was attached, as being the vehicle of Christian propaganda.

Very happy and suggestive are Dr. Mommsen's remarks on the literary activity

of the provinces. Gaul, 'the land of learning and teaching,' is the producer of panegyric, *vers de société*, and at last of pious hymns. Asia Minor is the home of the Sophists sent out over all the Empire like lamps all of one pattern. Syria produces epigrams, feuilletons and romances. Africa, once the '*nutricula causidicorum*,' at last becomes the seat of Church literature, while Spain alone entered thoroughly into the development of Italian literature. Curious too is the literary activity of Berytus, 'the Latin island in the sea of Oriental Hellenism,' while the little towns in Galatia were attracted to philosophy as the needle to the magnet, and Bithynia in the second century produced some of the best literary work of the Empire. On the commercial policy of Augustus and his successors the chapter on Egypt gives us fresh and valuable information. The expedition of Aelius Gallus was caused by the Arabian competition in the Oriental trade. The abortive mission of C. Caesar to the East was partly to have repeated the same attempt, while Nero's Oriental schemes and Trajan's Arabian policy looked also partly towards commercial ends. The relations of Rome with the Homeritae of Arabia Felix and the Axomitae of Abyssinia are a comparatively unknown, but not unimportant, chapter in its commercial history, on which Dr. Mommsen throws considerable light. It is to be regretted that both in this chapter and more or less throughout the volume, the references to authorities, whether 'texts,' inscriptions, or coins, are so comparatively rare. The value of the book to students would have been immensely increased if they had been enabled to verify and test many of Dr. Mommsen's statements for themselves.

E. G. HARDY.

Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der Indogermanischen Sprachen. Kurzgefasste Darstellung der Geschichte des Altindischen, Altiranischen (Avestischen u. Altpersischen) Altarmenischen, Altgriechischen, Lateinischen, Umbrisch-Samnitischen, Altirischen, Gotischen, Althochdeutschen, Litauischen u. Altkirchenslawischen. Von KARL BRUGMANN, ord. Professor der vergl. Sprachwissenschaft in Freiburg-i.-B. Erster Band. Einleitung u. Lautlehre. Strassburg. Trübner. 1886. 14 M.

At last we have the first instalment of a complete official statement of the new Indo-European grammar. The main principles of

the neo-grammarians (junggrammatiker) may be taken as proved, and the time has come for an authoritative manual. To those who still remain unconvinced that phonetic laws have no exceptions, that reconstruction by analogy is many times more common than direct transmission, that Indo-European vowels were very much like Greek vowels and very little like Sanskrit vowels,—to such sceptics this book has no proofs to offer; the proofs have come in the previous writings which Dr. Brugmann enumerates in his long list of 'literature.' But the book is itself a proof, to those who have any feeling for the *analogia fidei*. I cannot understand how any unbeliever can read it and fail to come out an adherent. A coherent and detailed system, following up all the facts and providing for them within its own limits, must be true so far as it goes. It may be re-interpreted, enlarged, subsumed, even inverted; but it can never be abolished.

It is well to emphasize that the new grammar is not a contradiction but a development of the old 'comparative grammar.' When Georg Curtius talked about 'sporadic variations,' he did not really mean that they were uncaused; he only meant that the causes were undiscoverable. And when we talk about 'phonetic laws with no exceptions,' we do not mean that we have discovered all the phonetic laws and all the cases where their products have disappeared, but only that we have faith that they would be discovered in an ideal system. It is one thing to say that 'original *gh* appears in Latin sometimes as *h*, sometimes as *g*,' and another to say that 'original *gh* appears in Latin as *h* between two vowels (*veho*) and *g* after a nasal (*tingo*).' If after that we are confronted with *figura*, we call it not 'an exception,' but 'a reconstruction for an earlier **fighura*, on the analogy of *tingo*.' And if we cannot similarly unravel the history of the 'velar' *gh*, or *g^h* (why does *ng^h* appear as *ngu* in *ninguit*, but as *v* in *levis*?), we have faith that something has happened below the surface; either the phonetic law is more subtle than we know, or an analogical product has extruded the strictly phonetic word. The scoffer might say that this is only a difference of terminology; and in one sense it is; but it is the difference between the terminology which acquiesces in ignorance and the terminology which strives after knowledge. This is the justification of the 'pedantry' and 'unpractical doctrinairism' of the new method. It is found in practice that the way to get new knowledge is to have precise, hard-and-

fast theories, and when the facts will not agree with them, to add new developments and riders till the facts are taken in. If the Ptolemaic astronomy had been content with a genial latitude of statement, it would have remained Ptolemaic to the end of time. But it insisted on a fresh epicycle for every irregularity, and its reward was the Copernican system. The same thing is true of every science. People begin with rough statements, from these they go on to precise statements, and then make great transforming discoveries. Of course it is easier to be wrong in precise statements than in rough statements; where you only profess to know one fact there is only room for one mistake, but where you profess to know ten facts there is room for ten mistakes. And even when we are right, it is harder to carry conviction in comparative philology than in other sciences, because the matter is so delicate and so fleeting.

This first volume is an account of the 'phonetic laws' only. That is, it gives a list of the Indo-European sounds as far as we know them, and an account of the form which they have taken, under all circumstances for which laws have been ascertained, in the oldest language (or pair of languages) of each group. It is this, and nothing else. Schleicher used to strike the English reader as wanting in 'general information,' but there is much less in Dr. Brugmann. His introduction of nineteen pages is chiefly taken up with the definition of the languages in question; he just refers to the 'Asia or Europe' controversy, without expressing an opinion. He does, however, commit himself in favour of the agglutinative theory of inflexions, with no mention of any other view (p. 14). 'What we put together under the heads of word-formation and flexion arose by composition, that is, by the following process: a group of words which formed a syntactical complex was fused into a unity, in which the whole was in some way isolated as against its elements. This word-fusion from the beginning onwards completed itself in the same way, as afterwards, in the age of separate languages (partly even in historical times) the final members of compounds became suffixes.' And then he gives the instances of Indo-European *ge*, Latin *mente*, German *heit*, Irish *mōr*, becoming mere suffixes in Gothic *mik*, French *fièrement*, German *Schönheit*, Irish *buadhmhār*. But he gives up the attempt to discover the origin of the Indo-European suffixes, only allowing that some verb-inflexions may contain pronouns.

Quite rightly, Dr. Brugmann avoids the attempt to convert historical grammar into phonetic physiology. There are two pages on the distinctions between 'voiced and voiceless,' 'sonorous and noised' (Sonor-laute und Geräuschlaute), 'sonant and consonant'; and a line or two at the head of each class of sounds, and a few remarks in the section on accents, and that is all. The object of comparative grammar is historical, not physiological; given certain languages, which are interesting on literary and historical grounds, to reconstruct their past history and common origin, for the sake of adding to our knowledge of the peoples who spoke them. All that physiology can do for us is to picture to us the facts which we establish from our documents; but physiology can never give us our linguistic facts; and conversely, when we have our linguistic facts, we can state them without physiology. If we could not trace the physiological process by which *us* became the Umbrian *f*, the fact would be just as certain, and the resulting etymologies would be just as valid. Where physiology comes in, is in recalling us to real life. In dealing with dead languages, we are all in danger of becoming paper etymologists; and if we do not check our processes by actual phonetic reproduction, we shall come back to the 'vowels that counted for nothing and the consonants that counted for very little.' Even the Indo-Europeans were human beings, and they must have talked like human beings. But this physiological groundwork is not part of the matter of our comparative grammar; it is one of the natural causes by which our matter is conditioned. There is every reason to study the physiology of speech, but no reason to put it into a book about any given set of languages.

Of course, we have not yet attained finality or unanimity. There are many points on which it is possible to disagree with Dr. Brugmann. In particular, his general theory of vowel-gradation is a little inconsistent. He professes, very wisely, to enumerate the different kinds of vowel-gradation which are actually found, and to take a quite agnostic line about their morphological parallelism with each other. He gives them as

1 e-series 0, ə, o, ē, ō (πα-τρ-ός, πα-τέρ-α, φρά-τορ-α, πα-τήρ, φρά-τορ)

2 ē-series 0, ə, ē, ō (da-dh-más, hi-tás, τί-θη-μι, θη-μός)

3 ā-series 0, ə, ā, ō (ta-sth-úsi, sthi-tás, sta men, φωρή)

4 ō-series 0, ə, ō (da-d-más, δά-ρες, δί-ω-μι)

5 a-series 0, a (o?), ā, ō (j-mán-, ἄγ-ω, στρατ-ᾱγ-ός)

6 o-series 0, o, ō (0 doubtful, ὀδμή, ὀδός);

where ə is a 'neutral vowel' inferred from a Sanskrit *i*, corresponding to a Greek ε, o, or a, and 0 is the stage in which the vowel vanishes altogether. Then he goes on (pp. 248, 249): 'We distinguish six gradation-series (Ablantsreihen). . . . Attempts have been made by many . . . to systematise these series morphologically, that is, to put together those phases out of the different series which correspond to a given morphological category, e.g. to the root-syllable in the participle formed with -to-, or in the indicative formed with the so-called thematic vowel. . . . The investigations instituted in this direction have not yet gone far enough to let us give a system of gradation-series *completely worked out* on this principle. And it is questionable whether we have a right to aim at the attainment of such a system at all, in the sense in which it is usual to do so. Several strata of formations, distinct in their time of origin, seem to overlies each other. In those which arose earlier, much may have been obliterated by transference of forms before the new cause of gradation came into activity; and the later phonetic law which called new distinctions into being did not act in the same way as the older law or laws. In this case it is from the outset impossible to expect that parallels can be found everywhere.' (Italics are the spaced type of the original.)

This is reasonable. But, in practice, Dr. Brugmann commits himself (pp. 257, 259) to Dr. Hübschmann's view that *a* is a 'weak-stage' vowel in *blames* and *si-stames*, but a 'first-high-stage' vowel in *agō* and *aidhō*, so that *bhā-mi blames* is like *ei-mi i-mes*, and *aidho idhros* show an exactly parallel gradation. This may be so, but in a professedly non-committed treatise it is decidedly taking a side to omit all mention of M. de Saussure's view that gradation is always epsilon-gradation (substituting *e* and *o* for his *a*₁ and *a*₂). M. de Saussure would say (with the above substitution) that *idh* and *aidh* are phonetic variations of the same weak stage, and that the two high stages are *eaidh* and *oidh*, just as the high stages of *bha* are *bhea* and *bhou* (φαπὲν, φᾱπὲ, φωρή). This is at least possible. As to *jmán-* and its compounds,

which are adduced to prove that $g:ag::s:es$, the demoralized vowel-system of Sanskrit can never prove that a vowel was left out in Indo-European. But I am not here defending the universal epsilon; I only insist that Dr. Brugmann should have mentioned it. On two other vowel-groups Dr. Brugmann has taken the view which appears to me to be against all the evidence. I cannot understand how he can give up the precise testimony of Greek and Latin to the root-vowels of $\tau\acute{\iota}\theta\epsilon\mu\epsilon\nu$ and $\acute{\alpha}\phi\epsilon\tau\acute{o}s$, $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$ and $\pi\omicron\tau\acute{o}\nu$, in favour of the colourless residuum of Sanskrit. I should explain *dadhmās* and *hitās* and their like, on the simple principle that the Indians found *a* constantly disappearing in places where it represented *e*, and so they got into a habit of leaving out *a* wherever it came; but in some of these cases they re-inserted *i* as a connecting vowel. This must be the history of *pitā*, because no European language shews any trace of any vowel but *a* in the first syllable; in $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\acute{o}s$ —*satus* and $\delta\omicron\tau\acute{o}s$ —*datus*, we have before our eyes Indo-European vowels intermediate in pronunciation between *e* and *a*, *o* and *a*, which should be added, as M. de Saussure has added them, to the Indo-European alphabet. Dr. Brugmann's ϵ is a very good vowel in its place, where it comes between a root and a suffix ($\mu\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\tau\acute{o}s$, *genitus*); but it should be kept to its place.

Many parts of the book cannot be judged until it is finished. On the treatment of $\acute{\imath}$ (the *-i*-consonant which English books call *y* or *j*), for instance, Dr. Brugmann's statements have no claim to completeness until he has accounted for the δ and ζ which he will not accept as phonetic successors of $\acute{\imath}$. On p. 202 (note) he suggests that the $\alpha\delta$ -stems may be *t*-stems in disguise, but only as an *obiter dictum*. The $\iota\delta$ -stems remain, and the $\delta\iota\omicron$ -stems, and the verbs in $-\zeta\omega$. In the next volume he must give an account of their formation independent of $\acute{\imath}$. Till then, the 'parasitic dental' must hold its ground, as a possible explanation, for which future knowledge may supply the distinctive phonetic conditions. In the same way, all that is said (pp. 256, 463) about the shortening of the first element of the original $\bar{o}\acute{\imath}$, $\bar{e}\upsilon$, and similar groups, before a consonant, may be true, but it depends on the treatment of formations like $\acute{\epsilon}\psi\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha$, $\tau\omicron\acute{\imath}s$, $\nu\eta\upsilon\varsigma$, $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\sigma\iota$, about which Dr. Brugmann incidentally expresses opinions that will require discussion in the next volume. It is a time-honoured custom, and it seems scientific, to begin with phonetic laws, and go on to suffixes and terminations, but I am not sure

that it would not be better to reverse the order. The order of discovery has certainly been grammar first, and phonetics after; all the brilliant discoveries which are embodied in this book were made in turning over grammatical formations. And in the order of exposition, whichever end you begin at, you must bring in something from the other. Would it be any more illogical to say 'the accusative ended in *m*; the Greek α and ν represent Indo-European *m* after a consonant and a vowel respectively,' than to say, as the current method does, 'Indo-European *m*—after a consonant it was a vowel, and is represented in Greek by α , e.g. accusatives in α —after a vowel it was a consonant, and is represented in Greek by ν , e.g. accusatives in ν '? The practical advantage of the reversed order would be that phonetic laws coming incidentally in grammar can be stated more concisely and remembered more easily, and have more self-proving power, than grammatical formations coming incidentally in phonetics. But of course this is an objection to established custom, not to Dr. Brugmann.

'Can this book be used by schoolmasters?' the practical Englishman asks. It not only can, but it must. In conjunction with the author's Greek and Dr. Stolz's Latin grammars in Iwan-Müller's *Handbuch der Klassischen Alterthumswissenschaft*, it forms a compendious and complete guide to our present knowledge of Greek and Latin grammar. The two or three points on which I have indicated a possible divergence of opinion are only a drop in the bucket; no great harm will be done if a teacher takes Dr. Brugmann as infallible on all of them. If schoolboys are to be taught any comparative grammar at all, they must be taught it on rigorous principles. Everywhere else in education we take pains to tie the youthful mind down to precise, measured, verifiable statements; in comparative philology alone we are content with 'hollow spaces planked over with the wordy ignorance which we call knowledge.' It is not, perhaps, possible as yet to teach our more minute and complicated formulae to schoolboys; the immediate necessity is to get rid of the old indiscriminate formulae. It is better to say nothing about vowels than to call them 'Indo-European *a*,' better to leave $\beta\acute{\alpha}\theta\omicron\varsigma$ — $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\theta\omicron\varsigma$ unexplained than to talk about 'nasal insertion.' It is to be hoped that, for the present, colleges will cease to tempt schoolboys with questions on comparative philology in their scholarship papers; but let me assure teachers that a candidate

never loses and often gains by leaving those questions alone. While I am suggesting, may I add that we may all do one small service to our science, for which no new knowledge is wanted? We may cease to call it 'philology.'

T. C. SNOW.

Some points of Roman Law in Prof. Tyrrell's Edition of Cicero's Correspondence. Vols. I., II. Dublin Univ. Press. £1 4s.

THIS edition has been so heartily and generally welcomed that I occupy no space with praising it. It is a pleasant and scholarly work. But I wish even now the editor would put the various readings at the foot of the page, and not assume the correctness of the chronological order adopted by his predecessors. In using it I have noticed a few passages where he seems to me to have mistaken the law, and some other slips which may be more briefly dealt with. I take the more important passages first, out of their proper order.

Letter cxxi. *Fam.* vii. 13. *Tantum metuo ne artificium tuum tibi parum prosit: nam, ut audio, istic 'non ex iure manum consertum sed magis ferro rem repetunt,' et tu soles ad vim faciundam adhiberi: neque est quod illam exceptionem in interdicto pertimescas, 'quo tu prior vi hominibus armatis non ueneris'; scio enim te non esse procacem in lacescendo.*

Trebatius, the lawyer, is attending Caesar in his camp in Gaul, and Cicero chaffs him on his position. 'I am only afraid, that your professional craft is of little good to you, for, I am told, where you are (to quote Ennius) "men don't join issue in due course of law, but effect a recovery sword in hand," and actually *you* are now called in to use force! Well, there is no ground for much fear of your being troubled with the plea of having been the first to come with a force of armed men, for I know you are not forward in attack.'

Trebatius, if dispossessed of some land by armed violence, would apply to the praetor for an interdict which would state the issue in some such words as these, addressed to his opponent: *Unde tu, C. Trebatium vi hominibus armatis deiecasti, eo C. Trebatium restituas.* If, however, Trebatius had himself previously turned out his opponent by the like means, the opponent would urge the praetor to insert in the formula after '*deiecasti*' *quo ille prior vi hominibus armatis non uenerit*; and the praetor would naturally consent. The matter would then be

referred to a judge to decide with these instructions. If the judge found that Trebatius had been ejected by armed force and had not himself been the aggressor by the same means, the injunction would be made final, and the defendant probably be condemned in damages: if his prior aggression were proved or his dispossession not proved, the injunction would drop and in some cases the plaintiff would pay a forfeit (cf. Gai iv. 141, 161-165).

There is I think no doubt that the interdict referred to is *de vi armata* (which in the Digest is consolidated with that *de vi Dig.* xliii. 16). Prof. Tyrrell erroneously takes it to be the interdict *uti possidetis*, and naturally finds difficulties. He has been misled by the language of Cic. *Caecin.* 22, § 63 and Gai iv. 155, whence he infers that no *exceptiones* were allowed when armed force had been used. It is not necessary to assume in either passage that such a plea as we have here was in question. But that such a plea was allowable is, I think, clear (1) from this passage itself; (2) from the analogy of the interdict '*de vi*' (cf. Cic. *Caecin.* § 92); (3) from the reason of the thing, supported by the language of the Digest.

The use of armed violence in matters of ejectment was rightly held to be so contrary to the dignity of legal procedure as to require peremptory prohibition. Accordingly a person who had himself acquired possession from his opponent by force (*vi*, not *vi armata*) or by stealth or by sufferance was yet entitled to immediate restoration, if his opponent ejected him by armed force. Obviously the same principle applies against him, if he has himself used armed force. His own armed violence disentitles him from claiming the peremptory protection of the law, on the same principle on which armed violence disentitles his opponent from pleading the wrongful possession of the former. Indeed the two acts may well have been successive events in one day's struggle. If Trebatius (in the supposed case) had brought a body of armed men to dispossess his opponent, he could not be aggrieved by his opponent's resorting to the same means to dispossess him in turn. *Eum qui cum armis venit, possumus armis repellere, sed hoc confestim, non ex intervallo; dummodo sciamus non solum resistere permissum ne deiciatur, sed, et si deiectus quis fuerit, eundem deicere non ex intervallo sed ex continenti.* (Ulpian in Dig. xliii. § 16, l. 3, § 9; and cf. l. 1, § 27, 28.)

(Keller *Semestr.* p. 333 *sqq.* suggests that the absence of this plea in later times was due to a restriction of the meaning of *deicere*, so that it was held to be no ejectment, if a person recovered by force what he lost by force).

Cicero refers to this same interdict in *Fam.* xv. 16, § 3, and of course frequently in the speeches for Caecina and Tullius.

Bruns (*Die Besitzklagen*, p. 42) and others take the words *et tu soles ad uim faciendam adhiberi* to refer to conventional force in the course of legal procedure. I do not think that is the natural meaning of the words, and I doubt the employment of juriconsults for the purpose. Of course there is a playful allusion to it, point being given by the infrequency of Trebatius being so employed.

Letter cxlviii. *Q. Fr.* iii. 1, § 3. *Calvus aiebat aqua dempta et eius aquae iure constituto et seruitute fundo illi imposita, tamen nos pretium seruare posse si uendere uellemus.*

Prof. Tyrrell translates 'Calvus (probably a juriconsult) holds that even if the use of the water were not included in the sale and the right of the vendor over it were established, and the estate were made liable for the water (were made subject to this easement) we could still get our purchase-money for it if we wished to sell.'

This is wrong in several places. Calvus (if this be the right reading) was probably a land agent. A juriconsult is not the man to tell the value of an estate. The precise relations of the estates are not certain, but I understand the *fundus Bouillanus* to be the same as the land said at the beginning of the section to have been bought at Arpinum from Fufidius, and to be well off for water. Arpinum and (the known) Bovillae are many miles apart, so that the meaning of *Bouillanus* is uncertain. I take *Arpini* to be merely the place of purchase. At any rate Quintus had the intention of taking water from one estate to another. I translate; 'Calvus declared that if the water were taken away, and the right of drawing it were established, and a servitude imposed on that estate, we should still get our price.' As owner of the two estates Quintus could deal with the water as he liked. But if he sold the estate whence he took the water, he would have to declare in the conveyance that he sold subject to this right. That would be establishing for the dominant estate (where he used the water) a *ius aquae ducendae*, and imposing on the servient estate the obligation to allow the water to be so taken. *Ius aquae*

(*ducendae*) *constituere* is a regular technical phrase, cf. Dig. viii. 5, l. 10, *de iure quo aqua constituta est*; *ib.* l. 18, *antequam is actori ius aquae ducendae constituisset*, &c.

A little earlier in the section Prof. Tyrrell notes on the words *piscina et salientibus additis* that 'springs, not jets d'eau,' are meant by *salientibus*. Surely the natural translation is just the reverse, 'if you add a basin and some jets d'eau.' Cf. Dig. xix. 1, l. 15.

Letter cxlix. *Att.* iv. 17. This famous passage, describing the monstrous agreement made between the consuls of the year 54 B.C. and two of the candidates, has been the subject of much discussion. *Consules flagrant infamia, quod C. Memmius candidatus pactionem in senatu recitauit, quam ipse suusque competitor Domitius cum consulibus fecisset, uti ambo HS. quadragena consulibus darent si essent ipsi consules facti, nisi tris augures dedissent, qui se adfuisse dicerent, cum lex curiata ferretur quae non lata esset, et duo consulares, qui se dicerent in ornandis provinciis consularibus scribendo adfuisse cum omnino ne senatus quidem fuisset. Haec pactio, non uerbis sed nominibus et perscriptionibus multorum tabulis cum esse facta diceretur, prolata a Memmio est nominibus inductis auctore Pompeio.*

Prof. Tyrrell objects to the usual interpretation of *inductis* as 'cancelled' on the ground that that meaning is here unsuitable. If it is supposed that Memmius cancelled the main items of the agreement, how could he prove his case, and what was the object of cancelling either names of contracting parties or anything, when his natural course was to lay the compact before the senate just as it stood? Boot supposes that the consuls, not Memmius, did the cancelling; but Prof. Tyrrell replies that the consuls would be more likely to have destroyed the whole instrument. Rein supposes that the *nomina* cancelled were the same *nomina* named before, viz. the entries in ledgers. v. Salpius (*Novation und Delegation*, p. 94) understands the consuls to have cancelled the book-entries and Memmius to have produced the written agreement: *nominibus inductis* is then 'after the entries had been cancelled.' Prof. Tyrrell thinks *inductis* should be taken as *inducerent* in *Verr.* i. § 106 and *inducetur* and *induceretis* in *Rull.* ii. §§ 70, 98; and translated 'duly entered.' He reiterates this opinion in the Preface, p. xi.

I think this makes the words *nominibus inductis* quite otiose, and that there is no reason for giving an unusual instead of a

usual meaning to *inductis*; (for *inducere*, 'to cancel,' see Dirksen's *Manuale*, s.v.). I believe the *nominia* cancelled were the *nominia* of the three augurs and the two consulars who were to give false evidence, and it does not matter for this purpose whether the *nominia* were names or entries or items, and whether the *pactio* was a separate written document or not. It may have been such, but as the *pactio* is said to have been made *nominibus et perscriptionibus multorum tabulis*, it seems better to suppose no such separate written document containing the whole plot to have existed. It was not made *verbis*, i.e. by a formal stipulation such as was usually applied to bind a bargain. How then was it made? That in some degree depends on the meaning which we attach to *perscriptionibus*, and, as the word occurs in several passages, it is worth while to examine it.

Perscribere is used of writing a matter out in full (e.g. Cic. *Cat.* iii. § 13, &c.), and *perscriptio* is thus 'a writing of some transaction.' But the precise nature of the writing so denoted is not easy to determine. It evidently had a business meaning, but whether this meaning was wide and general or specific is not clear. (a) In *Rosc. Com.* §§ 1, 2, 5 it appears clearly to be used of entries in the ledger, descriptive of the person credited or debited with sums of money. In *Flac.* § 44 the meaning is the same, only that the entry gave a description of the particular purpose of the payment as well as of the name of the creditor or debtor. Similarly in *Ferr.* v. § 48 and *Ter. Phorm.* 923 (if we read with most MSS. *perscripsi* instead of the Bembin *discripsi*). (b) In the tablets found at Pompeii (Bruns' *Fontes* ii. cap. 9) *perscriptio* is the title ('docket') affixed to some documents which in form are certificates of receipt of money. And yet (c) a third mercantile meaning seems to be given by Cic. *Att.* xii. 51 *Tiro narravit perscriptionem tibi placere* and xvi. 2, § 1 *quod perscribi oportet* which clearly imply some mode of settling a debt—probably something in the nature of a bill of exchange drawn upon a banker at some distance of time, e.g. a six months' bill. And in *Liv.* xxiv. 18, § 14 *a quaestore perscribatur* we have clearly bills drawn on the quaestor. (For this use of the preposition *a* cf. Cic. *Flac.* § 44). Perhaps these three meanings may be reconciled by supposing *perscribere*, *perscriptio* to mean originally simply 'expression of the debt in writing' and to be specially applied to entries in a ledger or to receipts or to orders on a banker. It is possible to com-

bine the two last, as in warrants on the English Treasury, which contain a receipt for the money, to be signed by the payee and exchanged by his banker against payment. In *Att.* ix. 12 § 3, where Cicero is describing how the world generally is going on in the regular routine (notwithstanding the political crisis implied by Pompey's being actually besieged by a Roman army), he says *virī boni usuras perscribunt* 'honest men are entering up their interest,' where the *virī* may be the creditors (according to Mommsen, *Hermes* xii. p. 112) or the debtors. So Cic. *Orat.* i. 58 *de tabulis et perscriptionibus* may well be merely 'about ledgers and entries,' but may also be 'about documents and receipts (or cheques).' In *Phil.* v. § 11 Antony is described as squandering public money *falsis perscriptionibus donationibusque* 'by fictitious book entries (or receipts or cheques) and gifts'; fictitious, because professing to be in accordance with Caesar's orders. Suet. *Caes.* 42 *deducto siquid usurae nomine numeratum aut perscriptum fuisset*; 'less anything which had been paid in cash or by cheque (or book entry) under the head of interest.'

It is thus hard to say the precise meaning of *perscriptionibus* in our passage. But whether *perscriptionibus* is the fuller description of the nature of the debt and *nominibus* the mere entry of money paid to, or received by, a person named, or again *nominibus* includes the whole of the book entry and *perscriptionibus* denotes a number of warrants for payment in some shape or other, in either case the bargain with the consuls was contained in a number of books and documents.

I do not see how the dependence of the payments on the consuls' good faith could be secured by these documents. And for this purpose a *pactio ne peteretur* (to guard against the payments being enforced if the consuls played false) may have been necessary and may have been put in writing and may have been read out in the senate.

But it is not likely that the agreement was made in blind confidence that some three augurs and some two consulars would be found ready for the plot. I think particular persons were first secured; book entries or money orders in their favour were made and provisionally (at any rate) executed. But as Memmius or some one blotted out the names, Cicero could describe only the general character of the plot and the number of augurs and consulars concerned.

If it be insisted that *nominibus* should mean the same in both places (I do not think

it at all necessary), we may suppose that the whole or part of the book entries were blotted out, but that yet from the remainder or from the context the nature of the entry may have been sufficiently discoverable to support the evidence afforded by the *perscriptiones* or by Memmius' confession.

[Mommsen (*Hermes* xii. p. 111) considers *perscriptio* to be a 'payment accompanied by a formal receipt' and endeavours, not successfully, as I think, to reduce all the passages under this meaning].

Letter ix. *Att.* i. 4. *Cui cum aequi fuisset, tamen &c.* Tunstall, Boot, and Tyrrell all take this as meaning 'though I might have taken a lenient view (had I so willed).' I cannot think Cicero would have so used a simple pluperfect subjunctive instead of a periphrasis with *possum* or the future participle (cf. my grammar, § 1521). Why not translate, 'Although I had been favourable to him'? The verdict was that of the judges. Cicero gained general applause, because the verdict was approved and he had presided as praetor in an able and impartial manner, notwithstanding his feeling for the defendant.

Letter xx. *Att.* i. 14, § 3. Cicero says that the support given him by Crassus in the senate was the more remarkable *quod meis omnibus litteris in Pompeiana laude perstrictus esset*. Prof. Tyrrell inserts *orationibus* after *meis* and calls (in the second edition) *omnibus litteris* an *ablativus mensurae*. The ablative of measure is however only used with comparatives or expressions of precedence or distance. Still *omnibus meis litteris* may mean (cf. my grammar, § 1170) 'throughout all my letters' or 'throughout all my literary compositions,' and in either case offers no difficulty requiring addition to the text. A person writing to his intimate friends does not always so express himself as to leave nothing obscure to persons 1900 years after in *ultima Thule*.

In the next section *Aperte tecte* is explained rightly in the beginning of the note and wrongly in the end. Cicero would never put two such adverbs to qualify, instead of to contrast with, one another.

Letter liii. *Q. Fr.* i. 2. *Rogo ut procuratoribus Flavii remittas de deminuendo*. Prof. Tyrrell oddly translates 'allow them to draw on the money,' and says if the word *remittas* were here to be taken in its more usual sense of 'making a concession,' 'letting off,' Cicero would have written '*de non deminuendo*.' But if we take *de* as meaning 'concerning,' not 'from,' *non* is not necessary (see Prof. Tyrrell's own note on *missione*,

letter i. § 3). Quintus had at the request of a creditor ordered Flavius' agents not to impair the estate of L. Octavius Naso, to which Flavius was heir, till the debt was paid. Marcus points out to his brother that he had rashly assumed that the claim was good and had thereby done injustice to Naso. He requests Quintus therefore to withdraw his order. 'I beg you to make a concession to Flavius' agents in the matter of impairing the estate.' *Deminuere* is used somewhat technically. Cf. *Cic. Flac.* § 84; *Dig.* xviii. 1, l. 26; xxviii. 8, l. 17.

Letter cxxvi. *Fam.* vii. 23, § 2. *Tu autem ignarus instituti mei, quanti ego genus omnino signorum omnium non aestimo, tanti ista quattuor aut quinque sumpsisti*. Prof. Tyrrell (see also the *Corrigenda*) apparently misunderstands the passage, for he proposes to omit *non*, to read *aestimem* for *aestimo*, to treat *tanti* and *quanti* as not correlative, and to regard *quanti* as = *quantuli*. I do not see the difficulty. Fadius Gallus had bought for Cicero some statues of Bacchae and one of Mars, and had given a high price. Cicero wanted some cheap statues for his palaestra of a totally different kind, perhaps something respectable, as philosophers, &c. 'In your ignorance of my ways (or purpose) you have bought those four or five statues at a price at which I don't value all the statues in the world.'

Letter cliv. *Att.* iv. 18. *Sulla non dubitans quin foris esset, (Gabinium) postularat*. Prof. Tyrrell doubts what he says is the common interpretation of *foris esset* 'was in debt,' but still inclines to a metaphorical use 'was out at elbows,' 'was a defaulter': see p. 183 and pref. xii., xxi. In the other passage where it is used, also of Gabinus, (*Pis.* § 2) Madvig reads *sordidissime* and treats this supposed use of *foris esse* with scorn. Why may not Sulla have thought Gabinus to be 'away from home'? I see no occasion for a metaphorical meaning in this letter. If the words be retained in the speech, it is perhaps possible to take it as 'on the world,' i.e. not a steady citizen living at home on his own means.

Letter clx. *Q. Fr.* iii. 9, § 8. Prof. Tyrrell translates '*tabulas obsignare*' 'sign the will.' The expression is incorrect. Roman wills were not executed by 'signing.' They were written (by any one), declared in the presence of witnesses to be the testator's will, and then the tablets were sealed up (*obsignantur*) by the witnesses. The sealing was not for execution, but to protect the contents from being altered. The same with other documents: see *Cic. Flac.* 9, § 21 and the regu-

lations for opening wills in Dig. xxix. 3. Even *subscribere*, *scriptio*, when used in such matters, did not mean what we moderns understand, viz. the mere writing of the executant's name, but a declaration, e.g. *Decretum. Fieri placet. Iubentius Celsus promagister subscripsi* (Wilmann's *Inscr.* no. 312). The '*scriptio*' of the testator to wills was first required by a constitution of Theodosius II. anno 439: see the elaborate essay of Bruns' *Die Unterschriften*, &c. in his *Kleine Schriften*, bd. ii.

Letter clxii. *Fam.* i. 10 (misprinted 20).

Illo si ueneris, tamquam Ulixes, cognosces tuorum neminem. Prof. Tyrrell, to save Cicero from the charge of not knowing his Homer well, accepts Klotz's conjecture of *cognoscere nemini*. But is this Ciceronian Latin? Ovid, no doubt, could say and said *lugebere nobis*, but Cicero would not use a dative of the agent with a finite verb, except where 'for' a person is as suitable a meaning as 'by' him, e.g. *N. D.* ii. 48 *bestiis cibis quaeritur*; *Q. Fr.* i. 1, 25 *aes alienum contrahi civitatibus*.

H. J. ROBY.

SHORTER NOTICES.

Novum Testamentum, etc. curante F. H. A. SCRIVENER. *Editio Major.* Deighton, Bell et Soc: MDCCLXXXVII. 4s. 6d.

THIS is a third, and greatly enlarged and improved edition of a well-known work, the first edition of which appeared in 1859, and the second in 1876. As before, the text of Stephens of 1550 is taken as the standard, while the chief variations are given in foot-notes. The main features of this new edition are that (1) to the readings adopted by Beza, Elzevir, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles have been added those of Westcott and Hort and of the Revisers; (2) carefully selected references to parallel passages have been inserted in the outer margin; (3) for the convenience of those who use this volume in collating MSS., the Ammonian sections and Eusebian canons are given in the inner margin, a table of these being added to the Preface. The paging is the same as in the second edition; room for this additional matter being obtained by increasing the size of the page. But the volume may still be carried in a fairly capacious pocket. In a few paragraphs added to the former Preface the learned editor speaks with gratitude, admiration, and severity of the work of Westcott and Hort. There is no need to praise their fine intelligence, immense learning, industry, and sagacity. These rare gifts, while they excite our envy, fail (in Dr. Scrivener's judgment) *τὴν ἡττω λόγον κρείττω ποιεῖν*. Still half enslaved by the principles of Lachmann, they have gone wider of what Dr. Scrivener believes to be the truth than even Lachmann himself, and have produced a magnificent blunder rather than an everlasting possession (*splendidum peccatum, non κτήμα εἰς αἶν, in lucem miserunt*).

The Resultant Greek Testament, exhibiting the Text in which the Majority of Modern Editors are agreed, by R. F. WEYMOUTH, D. LIT. Elliot Stock: pp. xix. 644. 12s. 6d.

THIS work agrees with the preceding one in giving a Greek Text of the New Testament with a careful digest of the various readings adopted by editors; but it proceeds on a very different plan. Instead of adopting the exceedingly faulty text of Stephens as a standard, the editor constructs one for himself; not at first hand from MSS., Versions and Fathers, but at second hand from the most important editions of the last fifty years. His principle, therefore, is the same as that which for some years has been adopted in the *Cambridge Greek Testament*: but it is worked out in a much more comprehensive way. The editors

of that series have confined their attention mainly to Tischendorf and Tregelles, with occasional reference to Lachmann. Dr. Weymouth lays under contribution, not only these three great critics, but also Alford, the Bâle edition of 1880, Westcott and Hort, and the Revisers, together with Lightfoot and Elliott for S. Paul's Epistles, and Weiss for S. Matthew. This eclectic text, therefore, 'is intended to exhibit in a compact and intelligible form the latest results of textual criticism.' Hence the somewhat peculiar title, '*The Resultant Greek Testament*.'

Of the materials used only two require separate mention. The Bâle edition was edited in 1880 for the Bible Society of Bâle by Stockmeyer and Riggenbach. It is largely influenced by Tischendorf, and where it differs from him frequently anticipates the readings of Westcott and Hort. '*Das Matthäusevangelium*' of Bernhard Weiss was published at Halle in 1876. Its text also is greatly under the influence of Tischendorf.

The work has been executed with the greatest care; the proofs having been corrected, not from the 'copy' sent to the press, but from the editions themselves from which the 'copy' was taken. The accuracy of the readings quoted has, therefore, been doubly secured.

A student with either Scrivener or Weymouth in his hand can at once see what reading has been adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort, and the Revisers in any given passage; but with Weymouth he has the suffrages of other editors as well. Nor is this the only advantage. Weymouth's text is as clear and as free from interruptions as that of Westcott and Hort, and like theirs is spaced in accordance with the sense. In Scrivener the frequent changes of type, and still more frequent insertions of letters and numerals, are trying to the eyes. Besides which, it is much pleasanter to work with a text to which all the best modern critics would in most cases assent, rather than with one from which nearly every one, excepting Dean Burgon, would be perpetually dissenting.

The two works have appeared almost simultaneously, and Dr. Weymouth was evidently unaware that Dr. Scrivener had a third edition in preparation. It is interesting to contrast his opinion of Westcott and Hort with that of Dr. Scrivener, quoted above. He is convinced 'that critical judgment will more and more converge towards most of the conclusions arrived at by WH,' and he speaks of their Greek Testament as 'a work beyond all praise, both for the erudition displayed and for the simple

beauty of its "guileless workmanship," a work which will survive "aere perennius" long after unworthy vituperation has been forgotten.' We have no hesitation in assenting to this view rather than to the other.

Dr. Weymouth has had the advantage of twenty years' acquaintance with Tregelles while his work was in progress. He, therefore, speaks with some authority when he suggests what would have been the verdict of Tregelles, if he had had all the evidence which is now available. By a change of type in the foot-notes he lets us know the cases in which Tregelles, and Lachmann before him, arrived at a decision upon evidence which would now be considered as defective. In all such cases their authority is obviously of less weight. This is a further advantage which Weymouth's edition has over Scrivener's.

A. PLUMMER.

The First Epistle of St. John, with Exposition and Homiletical Treatment, by the Rev. J. J. LIAS, M.A. Nisbet and Co. 1887. 7s. 6d.

READERS of the *Homiletic Magazine* are already acquainted with this useful commentary. During the last five or six years it has been appearing piecemeal in that periodical, and now has been reprinted in a separate volume, as it well deserves to be. The plan is simple. The greater portion of each page is occupied by a pretty full explanation of the Epistle, clause by clause, a smaller portion at the foot being reserved for skeleton sermons on the passages expounded above. The Authorised Version is used, but is frequently corrected. The author takes a very modest view of his own labours. 'His task has simply been to select from the various commentaries before him such matter as seemed to him most likely to be useful to those for whom his own was originally designed.' But there are some good things in the volume which (so far as our knowledge reaches) are not to be found elsewhere; in particular the explanation of the very perplexing change of tense from the triple 'I write' to the triple 'I wrote' or 'I have written' in ii. 12-14, and the exposition of v. 6-8.

A. PLUMMER.

The Pulpit Commentary: Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians. Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1886. £1 1s.

THE greater part of this bulky volume consists of homiletical materials by various authors, who represent leading types of modern evangelical Christian thought. Of this we have read sufficient to convince us that it is a valuable storehouse of practical suggestions for preachers; but it is the remaining and smaller part of the volume, the 'Introductions' to the separate epistles, and the 'Exposition' of the Greek text, with which we are here concerned. Mr. Findlay's labours on *Colossians* furnish a real addition to our literature on the exegesis of this difficult epistle, and are quite deserving of separate publication. Mr. Caffin has carefully read and inwardly digested the best commentaries on Philippians, and is always scholarly and acceptable in his abridgments and re-presentation of them, but modestly refrains from striking out any new lines or advancing much original thought. Prof. Blaikie may without loss be left unread by those who possess any other commentary on the text of Ephesians: he scarcely deigns to notice the labours of previous scholars, and he is perpetually deserting his proper task of exegesis to indulge in the apparently more congenial and certainly less laborious occupation of sermonizing. The editors would perhaps have done better to have included him amongst the 'Homilists,' instead of numbering him with the writers of 'Scholarly Introduc-

tions' and 'such Exposition as shall meet the wants of the Student.'

The volume has probably been a long time in preparation, and this may account for some of the work being disappointingly not 'up to date.' It is not quite creditable, for instance, that in a book published at the end of 1886, neither Commentator nor Homilist says a word about the *Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων* (given to the world by Bryennios in 1883) either on 'bishops and deacons' in Phil. i. 1, or on 'apostles and prophets' in Eph. iv. 11; no wonder, after that, that the term 'apostles' is treated as though referring only to the Twelve.

Meyer's attractive explanation of ἀρπαγμός in Phil. ii. 6, stoutly upheld in the *Expositor* for Feb. 1887 by J. Agar Beet, is rejected by Mr. Caffin, as it previously was, perhaps rather too summarily, in a foot-note, by Bishop Lightfoot.

T. RANDELL.

Platonis Apologia Socratis, with Introduction, Notes, and Appendices, by J. ADAM, B.A., Fellow and Classical Lecturer of Emmanuel College, Cambridge. (Cambridge University Press.) 1887. 3s. 6d.

THIS is a good specimen of the improved school book of modern days. It contains a well-written introduction (pp. v.-xxxii.), an appendix on the text, in which the doubtful readings are discussed and some account is given of the principal MSS. (pp. 123-132); and it closes with a fair index. The explanatory notes are sensible and to the point, grappling with real difficulties and showing competent knowledge and ability. In a word the book may be pronounced a worthy representative of English scholarship. We note a few points in which we think there is room for improvement. 17 A, why should the ordinary ὑπό after πάσχειν, and again after ὄνομα ἔξετε (38 C) and ὀφλῶν (39 B) be noticed, and nothing said of the less common use after ἐπελαθόμεν? 17 C, ἐπὶ τῶν τραπεζῶν, is there any reason to confine this to bankers' counters? It seems more suited to Socrates' indiscriminate love of talk to take it (with Rost and Palm) generally of the stalls in the market. So Wyttenbach (Plut. *Mor.* 70 E) explains it *ad mensas tabernariorum, opificum, nummulariorum*. 19 A, οὐ πάνν, though it is conclusively shown in appendix C. to Cope's translation of the *Gorgias*, that this phrase cannot always be taken = πάνν οὐ, yet μόγῃς πάνν below (21 B) and the parallels cited by Shilleto on Thuc. I. 3, not to mention the greater appropriateness of the strong sense in passages like 42 D, οὐ πάνν χαλεπαίνω, make it doubtful whether the ironical interpretation is to be universally accepted. It should be noted that the same ambiguity as to the application of the negative is found in the Latin *non omnino*. 19 C, τοσαύτας δίκας, 'can hardly mean so grave a charge,' p. 125. Why not? the plural having a quasi-singular force, there is no need to take τοσαύτας = tot. 23 A, τὸ δὲ κινδυνεύει τῷ ὄντι ὁ θεὸς σοφὸς εἶναι, here it is said τό is the 'acc. in apposition to the sentence'; similarly τοῦναντίον is said to be acc. in apposition to sentence in 25 B, ἡ καὶ περὶ ἵππους οὕτω σοι δοκεῖ ἔχειν . . . ἡ τοῦναντίον τούτου πάν, εἰς μὲν τις ὁ βελτίους οἶός τ' ὦν ποιεῖν . . . οἱ δὲ πολλοί—διαφθείρουσιν, and in 34 A. So again in 39 B, τὸ δὲ δὴ μετὰ τοῦτο ἐπιθυμῶ ὑμῖν χρησμοδεῖν, (which is translated 'in the next place,') τὸ is called 'acc. in apposition to sentence.' This appears to us a wrong explanation. In 23 A, we take τὸ δὲ to be properly the subject to κινδυνεύει, in 25 B, τοῦναντίον to be subject to δοκεῖ, both being explained by the following nominatives in apposition, like the famous passage in Thuc. ii. 40, ὁ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀμαθία μὲν θράσος, λογισμὸς δὲ ὄκνον φέρει, which

may be considered a contraction from δ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἔχει ὥδε κ.τ.λ., or more strictly speaking, the vague δ bifurcates into ἀμαθία μὲν) (λογισμὸς δέ. In 39 B we should prefer to take τὸ δέ either as acc. of respect, which is closely connected with the acc. of extent, or as direct object of χρησµυδῆσαι, like ταῦτα after µαντευσάµενος in the last sentence of the same chapter. In 36 A we are glad to see that the loose τὸ μὲν μὴ ἀγανακτεῖν is satisfactorily explained without having recourse to an 'adverbial acc. in apposition.' As regards the text Mr. Adam is in general judiciously conservative. Once or twice he gives ingenious and plausible emendations, as of the corrupt μάλλον οὐδὲν ἀληθές in 18 B. We doubt, however, his change of αὐτὸ τὸ τοῦ 'Ομήρου (34 D) into αὐτὸ τ. 'Ο. 'To quote Homer again' would be a natural apology, if there had been a quotation made a few lines before, but not after an interval of some pages. The reading of the MSS. makes excellent sense 'this is just what Homer means by his οὐκ ἀπὸ δυνός.' Nor do we think that the reading μὴ ὑπέικων δὲ ἅμα καὶ ἅμα ἂν ἀπολοίμην (32 A) can be defended by a parallel in which two finite verbs are united by a double ἅμα. Riddell's ἅμα κἄν seems all that can be desired. It might be as well if the editor gave a note showing how he understood the μὴ with ὑπέικων. Just below 'forensic' seems hardly an appropriate rendering for δικανικά. Socrates is not referring to any technicalities of the law, but to such appeals to the feelings of the jury as were common in the law courts. We have only noticed one misprint of any importance, p. 77, line 12 from bottom, where 'loss' should be changed into 'insertion.'

Caesar, Bell. Gall. V. Edited by C. COLBECK. Macmillan. 1s. 6d.

THIS seems to us an excellent school-book. The introduction is a model of compressed yet lucid and interesting information; a particularly excellent feature being the illustrations. For example, besides good maps, on p. 29 we have pictures of *pilum*, *gladius*, *turris*, and *ballista*, which are better than pages of description, and on the opposite side the appearance of a legionary soldier and the *testudo* is made plain at a glance, by cuts taken from Trajan's column.

In the notes the worst dangers are avoided, namely, excessive aid, oppressive prolixity, and superfluous erudition. Occasionally Mr. Colbeck omits a point which seems to require a word: as for instance on p. 44, where *decerno* with inf. is passed over: p. 45 the suboblique *quod timeret* is also unnoticed in the notes, though it specially needs attention as it is followed by the illogical idiom *quod diceret*: perhaps *hinc accedebat* (6. 6) wants a word. From sins of commission the notes seem very free. We have only observed one awkwardly stated comment (on iii. 22) where it would be clearer to say that when the comparative is used in a final clause it takes *quo* (abl. of measure): one misprint (*si* for *sui*, viii. 21): and an obscure philological note on *per* (xxx. 7), which it were better to omit or explain more fully. And is not the identification of Arminius with Hermann now given up by the best authorities?

But on the whole the notes are sound, short, clear, and to the point: and the difficult geography is particularly well and thoroughly dealt with. The book has a vocabulary.

Livy—The Last Two Kings of Macedon. Selected. Edited by F. H. RAWLINS, M.A. 3s. 6d.

WE are glad to see a new portion of Livy brought within the reach of boys, by these extracts from books 31—45. Perhaps there are rather too many

notes (text, 68 pp., notes, 137 pp.): but Mr. Rawlins' work seems well and soundly done. His thoroughness is shown by the ample instances collected for exceptional usages, e.g., omission of object in technical phrases (p. 84), prepositions depending on nouns (p. 82), predicative participle (p. 86), adj. and partic. (p. 150): though occasionally perhaps needless, as in the mass of instances of abl. of separation (p. 77), historic infin. (p. 80), *ad* 'with a view to' (p. 89). Some people might object to the occasional philological notes (e.g., derivations of *corpi*, *infensus*, *incoho*, *dubius*, *luxuria*, *semila*, *templum*, *obliviscor*): but we rather agree that a sprinkling of the less obvious derivations is an improvement to a lesson, and is stimulating even if unsystematic.

In a few places improvements might perhaps be made. Thus (p. 76) the dat. *irritandis animis* is correctly explained, but why introduce the old error of gerundive being *future*?: on (p. 78) *trinum nundinum* is explained as 24 days (3×8) instead of 17 ($2 \times 8 + 1$). The note on *potius quam* with subj. (p. 118) is obscure: *pergit ire* is illustrated by βῆ δ' ἰέναι, a misleading suggestion, as though *pergo* meant 'I go': *dum viveret se defensurus* (p. 149) is rather final than indefinite: the note (p. 203) on *oportuerat* is not clear, as the indic. is quite normal, and we have rather to explain why it is not *oportuit* than why it is not *oportuisset*. But these are few, while the good notes are numerous.

The historical notes are brief, but clear and sufficient. Polybius is kept in view all through: and the schoolboy will be specially pleased with Livy's mistranslations (p. 112).

M. Tulli Ciceronis Oratio Philippica Secunda. With Introduction and Notes by A. G. PESKETT, M.A. (Cambridge, Pitt Press Series). 1887. 3s. 6d.

THE latest addition to the Pitt Press Series is an edition of the Second Philippic by Mr. Peskett. We confess that we do not see the need of another edition of this speech. Mr. Peskett is necessarily very largely indebted to his predecessors, Halm and Mayor,—and the amount of fresh material that he has added is hardly sufficient to justify an intrusion into a field that was already occupied. Mr. Peskett has done his work carefully and well, but we cannot but regret that his trouble was not better employed upon another subject. He has the advantage over Mr. Mayor in the printing and arrangement of his notes, which will doubtless make this edition more attractive to the junior students for whom it is intended: but we are afraid that these will not be much edified by references to Dräger's Syntax, nor indeed is this book in the hands of every schoolmaster. In one or two cases we should be inclined to differ from Mr. Peskett. The contrast of *accidit* and *contigisset* in § 17 can hardly be merely verbal, as he seems to imply—and the mood of *diceret* in § 7 (*at etiam litteras, quas me sibi misisse diceret, recitavit homo*) is not satisfactorily accounted for as consecutive. In both cases we should prefer the explanation of Halm. Nor should *vestrum* be explained as a contraction of *vestrorum*. The notes contain some valuable remarks by Dr. J. S. Reid. We regret to see that even he can give no satisfactory explanation of ch. 32–33.—G. C.

Cicero de Suppliciis, par ÉMILE THOMAS: *Oratio de Signis* (same Editor). Hachette et Cie. Each 1 f. 50.

THESE are charming little editions to look at: neat print, many pretty illustrations, the very minimum of notes—hardly more than six or eight lines at the bottom of each page. We fear the ordinary English schoolmaster would think there was not enough grammar in the notes: or that when grammar points

are explained they are explained too much by reference to the special case, generally by a mere rendering, and too little by reference to principles. This is true: and obviously the end aimed at is different from that of the common English school-book. The object of M. Thomas is not so much to make the boy a good grammarian, as to help him to read Cicero with ease and pleasure. We are strongly inclined to think that the English boy would learn Latin better and quicker by a judicious mixture of M. Thomas' method with the ordinary one. Anyhow, we get here (for 3 francs) two speeches of Cicero, with enough notes to read the text without interruption, admirable maps (*lying open with the text*), brief historical introduction, and charming illustrations.

Cicéron Jurisconsulte, par ARMAND GASQUY. 304 pages. Paris, Thorin. 5 fr.

It is pleasant to find continually fresh evidence of classical studies and scholarly antiquarianism among our French neighbours. The present work is an explanation of the subject-matter and legal difficulties in the speeches of Cicero for P. Quinctius, Q. Roscius the comedian, A. Caecina, and M. Tullius. There is a short introduction on law at Rome, and on Cicero's legal training and position, and a list of the principal passages in his writings bearing on law. I do not agree with all his explanations, but I know of no book in English or German or French which will be so useful and agreeable a companion to students of these speeches. Differences of view are certain to be found when we have to explain cases at law from the speeches of the advocate on one side only, and have but scanty information on the law from other sources. The title of M. Gasquy's book is certainly unlucky, for a jurisconsult Cicero was not. He was an orator and as such had to deal with various subject-matter in private suits, in public trials, in the senate, and before the people, and knew law, philosophy, and history enough for the purpose, but he neither drew pleadings, nor advised clients, nor taught legal students. Still in more than one instance the later law followed the line advocated by the great orator. Some other mistakes are scarcely worth mention: the Scaevolae are of course confused (p. 31), where P. Scaevola is named instead of his son Q. Scaevola the pontifex: *possidere* is derived from *potis* and *sedere* (p. 199): the *lex Julia de vi* is spoken of as if existing at the time of Cicero's speech *pro Caecina* (p. 213), and the use of *ληκόντιον ἀπώλεσεν* in the Ranae is misremembered on p. 218, &c. But these things are trifles and do not seriously interfere with the clear and competent exposition of the author's subject. His sympathies are large enough to satisfy all parties. He refers to St. Thomas Aquinas on a point of trade morality (p. 24 note); he notices the large pay of a ballet-girl (p. 176); and he justly upholds against Mommsen the worth of Cicero's advocacy and of Cicero's character.—H. J. R.

A Relief Map of Syracuse, constructed mainly after Holm and Cavallari. By J. B. JORDAN and F. HAVERFIELD, M.A. London. 1886. D. Nutt. £1 5s.

SCHOOLMASTERS and other scholars to whom the topography of ancient Syracuse is a matter of some interest—all, that is, who have read with any care the narrative of Thucydides—will feel grateful to Messrs. Jordan and Haverfield. As one who has been long interested in the story of that city, illustrious alike in glory and in suffering, who has studied the Sicilian books of Thucydides both at home and on the spot, I venture with much diffidence to offer a few remarks on this very attractive map.

The vertical scale is (as usual in such maps) exag-

gerated, being four times as large as the horizontal. To my eye this exaggeration is excessive, but for the purpose of teaching lads who have not been to the spot it may well be that such is not the case. The general effect is excellent: particularly when the map is kept in a horizontal position, as it should be. The scarping of the cliffs is admirably done, and the relation of the Outer City in general to the Island is made clear to a degree quite beyond the reach of ordinary maps.

When I get to the details of the Syracusan works I am met by the same doubts and difficulties as I have always felt when considering this subject. No doubt Messrs. Jordan and Haverfield have well considered the question of the probable position of the new wall built by the Syracusans in the winter of 415–4 B.C., but their map so exactly agrees with my recollections of the ground that my previous doubts about the wall remain as they were. In regard to the position of the third counterwork I heartily agree with their decision.

I note also that they do not give the great northern line of aqueduct marked by Schubring in his map. This is I suppose due to recent inquiry (of which I am ignorant) having shown that the German investigator was mistaken. But I remember that certain details noted in the course of my rambles on Achradina, and certain indications in the narrative of Thucydides, seemed to me to fall in with the plan of Schubring. He, if I remember rightly, went into the channel with the engineer in charge of the modern water supply.

Again, the interest in the locality is of a strictly military nature. It is not the great ability and wealth of its citizens, their victories in the Greek games, or the beauty of their coins, or the residence of great men, that make this little space of land so interesting, a sort of scholar's Mecca. The attraction to the pilgrim is that here he looks on the scene of three of the most important sieges of antiquity; one of which, the Athenian, has been described by an immortal pen. Now, looking at the map from this point of view, I deeply regret that—with the view no doubt of keeping down the size and weight—the peninsula of Thapsus has been omitted. Thapsus was the only base from which Syracuse was ever successfully attacked. While Nikias rested on Thapsus, all went well with him; when Marcellus moved the Roman headquarters to Leon, keeping Thapsus in his rear, it was the beginning of the end.

Let me repeat that the enterprise of Messrs. Jordan and Haverfield is deserving of great praise and speedy imitation. If I have noted points in which their results seem doubtful or slightly defective, I trust they will pardon remarks which may come of ignorance, but certainly do not come of ill-will. In looking on their map I am moved to desire a similar treatment of other sites in detail, and to dream of a beautiful large model showing to the eye the shores and islands of the Aegean Sea.—W. E. HEITLAND.

Lectures on Greek Prose. By A. SIDGWICK, M.A. Rivingtons. 4s. 6d.

MR. SIDGWICK's plan in this volume is to let his readers see the actual process which he follows in teaching his pupils how to write Greek prose. He chooses a passage; takes it, so to speak, to pieces; shows, if need be, where the English is ambiguous, or superfluous; points out pitfalls into which beginners, or, indeed, students who are by no means beginners, may easily fall; explains differences of construction and idiom, and so gradually clears the way till at last he presents us with the piece with its whole meaning brought out in excellent Greek. Most of us have

learnt that seeing a thing well done does not by any means ensure the being able to do it oneself. Still to watch good workmanship is recognized as one of the most efficient ways of learning. Mr. Sidgwick's book will be of no use to a teacher without scholarship, or possessing scholarship, but without the capacity of teaching; but to those who possess these qualifications and lack experience it will be most instructive. Indeed there are few, even among experienced teachers, who may not get some hints from it, if not in the matter yet in the mode in which that matter is given, so fresh, so vigorous, we may say, so entertaining is it.

A Latin vocabulary arranged on etymological principles as an exercise book and first Latin dictionary for public and private use by BENJAMIN HALL KENNEDY, D.D., LL.D. New edition revised and enlarged. London, Longmans, Green and Co. 1887. sm. 8vo. pp. xxxiii, 156. 2s. 6d.

THIS little book, dedicated to Prof. Skeat, is designed for use as a lesson-book, with any Latin Grammar, and as a first dictionary. The introduction (pp. ix—xxxiii) treats of the derivation and composition of Latin words and the changes of root vowels. The vocabulary proper contains (1) 2692 main words in the text, with a large number of cognate and derived forms in notes; to each word its meaning in English is appended, together with its English and French offspring; (2) select proper names; (3) select list (one page) of primitive roots; (4) numerals. Beginners will here learn to exercise the reason, and not the memory only, in acquiring a *copia verborum*, and also to make their English and French lessons bear upon their progress in Latin.—J. E. B. M.

Classical Coincidences, by F. E. GRETTON, B.D., formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and Head Master of Stamford Grammar School. London, E. Stock. 1887. 2s. 6d.

THE reader must be indeed hard-hearted who does not look with indulgence on a book introduced with the words 'Tis sixty years exactly since I first ventured to teach classics to others, because I so much delighted in them myself. My scattered band of pupils who are yet in the flesh—*παῖδες γὰρ πολλοὶ*—must account of this booklet as their old master's *Valer... Extremum quoniam vos alloquor, hoc est.* But apart from the sympathy naturally excited in us at the thought of a life whose days are thus 'bound each to each by natural piety,' there must be many who will share the author's pleasure in tracing out resemblances of thought and expression in writers of various ages, whether regarded as illustrating permanent characteristics of human nature or as showing actual imitation of an earlier by a later poet. Mr. Gretton does not seem to have been aware of the existence of other similar collections, such as those contained in Wetstein's Notes to the Greek Testament, or Mr. J. F. Boyes' most interesting *Illustrations of the Greek Tragedians*, in which many of his own examples may be found; but not a few of the most apposite quotations are, as far as our knowledge goes, here gleaned for the first time by himself. While thanking him for what he has given us, we hope that we need not take too literally his present farewell, but that, as in the case of Lander, we may still look forward to more 'last fruits from the old tree.'

An Introduction to Greek Sculpture. By L. E. UPCOTT, M.A. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1887. Pp. xv. 135. 4s. 6d.

INTENDED as 'a somewhat elaborate guide' to an ideal 'museum of casts and photographs, adapted to

the needs of a school.' Without professing to bring new lights to bear, the author claims to give a conspectus of the present state of foreign and English opinions on his subject. He has made the most of his limited space, which of course only admits of the barest outline of facts; though the result is somewhat dry reading as an independent work, it will probably serve as a useful introduction to a more complete study of the subject, where casts and photos are forthcoming. Like most English writers, Mr. Upcott devotes the majority of his space to the art of the Pheidian period, which occupies nearly one-third of the entire book. This leaves room for only a very brief treatment of the interesting period of the beginnings of Greek art and the sculptors of the early part of the fifth century. We could have wished for more information about this most fascinating part of the subject; this period, more than any other, illustrates the individuality of the Greek genius, and is, moreover, probably less familiar than any other to the readers for whom this work is intended.

For those who have not the time or inclination to absorb more elaborate treatises, it certainly fulfils a distinct want in England. We can only wish that the ideal museum which it presupposes might be realised in fact by the more general institution of galleries of casts. One or two inaccuracies should be corrected in a second edition; e.g., p. 31, *Anadoumenos*: p. 57, the Massimi Diskobolos is in marble, not bronze.—[C. S.]

Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum collegit et emendavit AEMILIUS BAEHRENS. Lipsiae, 1886. (Biblioth. Teubneriana). 4 Mk. 20.

THIS volume forms an important supplement to the editor's minor Latin poets. It does not include the dramatic fragments nor the *saturae Menippeae* of Varro, for which the reader is referred to the collections of Ribbeck and Bücheler. The preface is chiefly occupied by 'analecta ad versum Saturnium spectantia.' The foot-notes give a valuable apparatus of conjectures, including several of Munro's on Lucilius; the brilliant restoration *χρυσίζον* in fr. 414 (Cic. fin. II § 83) is ascribed to Marx, but was certainly independently made by the Cambridge scholar.—J. E. B. M.

M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton Libri. Recognovit WALTHER GILBERT. Lipsiae, 1886 (Biblioth. Teubneriana). pp. xxxiv 408. 2 M. 40 Pf.

THE editor (well known as a diligent student of Martial) has had the benefit of Prof. Friedländer's counsel. In the preface he treats of orthography (the most remarkable novelties are *brachium*, 'sic semper fere libri, cf. cil. i 198 52'; *epistola*, 'quia numquam nisi G xiv 11 1 libri *epistula* praebeant'; *suspicio*; *tintinabulum*) and gives an account of his critical notes, which contain the complete various readings of Schneidewin's two editions and of Scribnerius, and a selection from other editions and from MSS. Valuable additions are the 'index nominum,' pp. 380-407, and (p. 408) the dates of publication of the several books (according to Friedländer).

J. E. B. M.

Quaestiones Musonianae. De Musonio stoico Clementis Alexandriani aliorumque auctore scripsit PAULUS WENDLAND. Berlini, Mayer and Mueller, 8vo. pp. 6 and 66. 1 Mk. 80 pf.

It augurs well for this dissertation that it is dedicated to three masters in ancient philosophy, Bücheler, Diels, Usener. Wendland, after stating that the Christian teachers in Alexandria also professed philosophy, inquires into the doctrine and age of the Stoic

followed by Clem. Al. in the *paed.*; his relation to Epictetus; his cynicism (comparison of Lucian's Cynic to the *paed.*); the relation of the essays of Musonius to the *paed.*; the *λόγοι* of Musonius as source of Clement, of Pseudo-Musonius,¹ of Justin (or Pseudo-Justin),² of Tertullian, of Plutarch. It is shewn that Clement's authority lived at Rome. In an excursus an attempt is made to restore the text of Musonius from one chapter of the *paed.* (III 6, on the paradox the sage alone is rich). The author displays a familiarity with the philosophy of the empire which reminds one of Gataker. His work will be of great service to future editors of Seneca, Epictetus, Plutarch, Clement, Justin, Tertullian, and appears to have proved that Clement used, not the fragments of Musonius preserved by Stobaeus, but in all probability the very *λόγοι* ascribed to Musonius by Suidas.

J. E. B. M.

M. Iuniani Iustini epitoma historiarum Philippicarum Pompei Trogi ex recensione FRANCISCI RUEHL. *Accedunt prologi in Pompeium Trogum ab* ALFREDO DE GUTSCHMID *recensiti.* Lipsiae, Teubner, 1886). cr. 8vo. pp. lxii., 315. (Bibliotheca Teubneriana). 1 Mk. 50.

RUEHL has collated the chief MSS. and gives in the preface the principal various readings and conjectures. Several scholars, as Baehrens, A. v. Gutschmid, Theod. Nöldeke, Edwin Rohde, L. Müller, and L. Jeep (not Justus Jeep, the editor of Teubner's former edition) have supplied corrections and rendered other help. Ruehl no longer scents so many glosses in the text, as he did in 1872, and gives a more conservative text than he would do, if he could have added a complete apparatus. The (historical) index is new.—J. E. B. M.

DECIMI MAGNI AUSONII BURDIGALENSIS *opuscula.* *Recensuit* RUDOLFUS PEIPER. Lipsiae 1886 (Bibl. Teubneriana). pp. cxxviii 556. 6 M. 60 Pf.

THE works of Ausonius, with the exception of the Mosella, have been strangely neglected till of late. Haupt noticed a few of his quotations from classical poets, but most scholars for two centuries have treated him with silent contempt. Now we have two excellent editions, Schenkl's and Peiper's, appearing at an interval of three years.

The preface gives (1) an account of the MSS. pp. v—lxxxviii, and (2) a chronological table, followed by pedigrees and a supplement to the first index.

Before the publication of Schenkl's edition Peiper had treated at length of the manuscript evidence for the text of Ausonius ('Die handschriftliche Ueberlieferung des Ausonius' in *Jahrb. f. class. Philologie*, Suppl. xi 191–353, Leipz. 1879), and had proved that some 36 of the epigrams are the work of Italian scholars of the fifteenth century, and that several other pieces (*periochae* Homeri *Iliadis* et *Odyssiae*, *septem sapientum sententiae*, *de rosis*, *nomina Musarum*, *de signis caelestibus*), though ancient, are ascribed to Ausonius without authority. Lexicographers and commentators should revise their works by the light of this discovery.

The more important parallels are cited under the text; others in ind. i 'auctores et imitatores' (pp. 437–499). The second index 'nominum et rerum'

fills pp. 500–544. Ind. iii and iv give tables in which the pages and numbers of the new edition are compared with the Delphin, Bipont, and Schenkl's arrangements.—J. E. B. M.

M. Minucii Felicis Octavius. Emendavit et praefatus est AEMILIUS BAEHRENS. Lipsiae 1886, 1 M. 35 Pf. (Bibl. Teubneriana).

To Augustine's City of God, Commodian, Dracontius, Eusebius (h.e., p.e., d.e.), the *Christus Patiens*, Iosephus, Iuvenius, Nonni paraphr., and the N.T. of Buttmann, the enterprising publisher here adds for the benefit of theological students what Halm calls the 'aureus libellus' of Minucius. The preface is dated Groningen, June 1883, but a postscript dated Nov. 1885 informs us that it was not sent to press for more than two years later. Bährens makes the author a contemporary of Hadrian and Fronto, born at Rome and there educated under Trajan. He holds that Ebert has demonstrated that Tertullian borrowed from Minucius, an opinion not so generally held now as two years ago, and defines the years A.D. 162, 163, as the date of the Octavius. With regard to the dogmatic convictions of the author Bährens says: 'sic igitur statuo, Minucium aliquatenus praecessisse Straussios nostros Renanosque.' A selection of emendations is given below the text.—J. E. B. M.

From Schola to Cathedral. By G. BALDWIN BROWN. D. Douglas: Edinburgh. 7s. 6d.

THE main contention of this learned and ingenious contribution to the history of Christian architecture admits of being briefly stated. The 'schola' or meeting-house of a trade or other guild or corporation suggested, thinks Professor Brown, the earliest form of the Christian church. This is a sense of the word which is not familiar to the student of classical Latin, though it is akin to a classical usage; but it is found in the Jurists and in inscriptions. Every one will acknowledge the force of the author's argument when he urges that a community which was often persecuted by the State, and commonly the object of popular suspicion or hatred, must have had its places of worship of a very humble kind, suited for concealment rather than display. In after days, when Constantine had given the imperial recognition to Christianity, the stately *basilica* would naturally be the model of the church, indeed, would often be converted to the purposes of the now established religion; but in earlier times we should expect to find buildings of a very different kind utilized and imitated. Professor Brown finds a significant illustration in an edict of Alexander Severus, in which that Emperor, a great patron of trade-associations, decides in favour of the Christian community a dispute relative to a piece of land between it and the *popinarii*, on the ground that 'it was better that God should be worshipped in that place in any sort of way than that it should be given over to tavern-keepers.' The Christians wanted the place, then, for purposes of worship; and it is at least a probable conclusion that 'whatever building they erected on the ground thus secured would have been considered a *schola*, and would have had the form and architectural character of those buildings.' Further we cannot follow Professor Brown, and indeed it would scarcely be possible to do so without the aid of illustrations. But we have fulfilled our object if we have commended his very interesting volume to the notice of our readers.

¹ The author of the letter ascribed to Musonius.

² The author of the letter 'ad Zenam et Serenum.'

BLACK-EYED SUSAN.

1

All in the Downs the fleet was moored,
The streamers waving in the wind,
When black-eyed Susan came on board;
'Oh! where shall I my true love find?
'Tell me, ye jovial sailors, tell me true,
'Does my sweet William sail among your crew?'

2

William, who high upon the yard,
Rocked with the billows to and fro,
Soon as her well-known voice he heard
He sighed, and cast his eyes below.
The cords fly swiftly through his glowing hands
And, quick as lightning, on the deck he stands.

3

So the sweet lark, high poised in air,
Shuts close his pinions to his breast,
If chance his mate's shrill voice he hear,
And drops at once into his nest.
The noblest captain in the British fleet
Might envy William's lips those kisses sweet.

4

'O Susan, Susan, lovely dear,
'My vows shall ever true remain;
'Let me kiss off that falling tear;
'We only part to meet again.
'Change as ye list, ye winds; my heart shall be
'The faithful compass which still points to thee.

5

'Believe not what the landmen say
'Who tempt with doubt thy constant mind;
'They'll tell thee, sailors when away
'In every port a mistress find.
'Yes, yes, believe them when they tell thee so,
'For thou art with me wheresoe'er I go.

6

'If to far India's coast we sail
'Thy eyes are seen in diamonds bright;
'Thy breath in Afric's spiey gale,
'Thy skin in ivory so white.
'Thus every beauteous object that I view
'Wakes in my soul some charms of lovely Sue.

7

'Though battle call me from thine arms
'Let not my pretty Susan mourn.
'Though cannons roar, yet safe from harms
'William shall to his dear return.
'Love turns aside the balls that round me fly,
'Lest precious tears should fall from Susan's eye.'

8

The boatswain gave the dreadful word;
The sails their swelling bosom spread;
No longer must she stay aboard;
They kissed; she sighed; he hung his head.
Her lessening boat, unwilling, rows to land;
'Adieu!' she cries, and waves her lily hand.

Η ΜΕΛΑΝΟΣΣΟΣ ΣΟΥΣΑΝΝΑ.

1

ἐν ναυστάθμοις ἔκειτο πᾶς νεῶν στόλος,
σημεῖα δ' ἀνέμοις εὐπνύοις ἐσειέτο,
μελάνοσσος εὖτε παρθένος, νεανιῶν
ζητοῦσ' ὃν εἶχε φίλτατον, προσίκετο,
ναύταις δ' ἀνείπεν, ἱλαρὲ ναυβατῶν ὄχλε,
ἧ Γουλιέλμος οὐμός ἐσθ' ὑμῖν πάρα;

2

ὁ δ' αὖ, κεραφαῖς ὑψόσ' ἐγκαθήμενος,
πόντου τιναχθεὶς ἄλλου' ἄλλοθεν σάλφι,
ὡς αὐτίκ' ἔγνω φιλτάτης κόρης ὕπα,
ἔρωτι πληγείς, ὄμματ' ἔρριψεν κάτω·
σχοινία δ' ἄρ' ἄφνω διὰ χερῶν διέπτατο,
ἐπ' ἱκρίοις δ' ἔστηκεν ἀστραπῆς δίκην.

3

κορυδαλλὸς οὕτως ὑψόθεν τανύπτερος,
κορυδαλλίδος λιγείαν εἰ φωνὴν κλύη,
ἔγνωκε· συστείλας δὲ πρὸς στέρνον πτερὰ
εἰς τὴν κάτωθε σπεύδεται νεοσσίαν.
ναύαρχος αὐτὸς τοῦ βρετανικοῦ στόλου
τοιαυτ' ἂν ἤρπασ' ἄσμενος φιλήματα.

4

Σούσαν' ἐμῇ, Σούσαννα, φίλτατον κάρα,
βέβαιος ἡμῇ πίστις αἰὲν ἐμμενεῖ·
φέρ' ἐξαλείψω χεῖλσιν πτηνὸν δάκρυ.
ἀποίχομαι μὲν, νόστιμος δ' ἐλεύσομαι.
ἄνεμοι, μεταλλάσσεσθε· καρδίᾳ δ' ἐμῇ,
μαγνήτις οἶα, πρὸς σε, τὴν Ἄρκτον, ῥέπει.

5

οἴκοι μενόντων μὴ πίθη λόγοις βροτῶν,
πίστιν θελόντων ψεύδεσιν διαστρέφειν,
ὡς δῆθεν ἀνδρῶν ναυβατῶν, ὅπη χθονὸς
τύχως, ἔρωτα καινὸν εὐρόντων αἰεῖ—
πιθοῦ μὲν οὖν σὺ ταῦτα προσποιουμένοις,
σὺ γὰρ πᾶραι μοὶ πανταχῇ πλανωμένη.

6

τηλουργὸν εἰ γῆν Ἰνδικὴν προσπλεύσομαι,
λίθοι φαενναὶ σῶν ἔχουσ' ὅσων φάος
αὔραι τε Διβυκαὶ σαῖσιν ἐξασιν πνοαῖς,
ἐλέφας δὲ τὴν σὴν οὐ νενίκηκεν χρῶαν,
οὕτω δ', ὅσ' ἂν κάλλιστα προσβλέψω ποτέ,
μνήμη παρέσται ταῦτα Σουσάννης ἐμοί.

7

πολέμῳ δὲ σῶν περ φροῖδον ὠλενῶν ἄπο
μὴ μ' ἄντομαι δάκρυε, καλλίστη κόρη,
χάρμης γὰρ αὐτῆς ἐκ μέσων βροιτημάτων
σωθεῖς, σέ Γουλιέλμος ὕψεται πάλιν.
'Ἐρως γε πάντοσ' ἀμφὶς ἐκτρέφει βέλη,
μὴ μαργαρίτιδ' ὄμμα σὸν στάξῃ μίαν.

8

νῦν δ' αὖ κελευστής πικρὸν ἐξείπεν λόγον·
ἄνεμοι δὲ πληροῦσ' ἱστῶν κόλπους βαθεῖς.
οὐδεὶς μένειν Σούσανναν· ἐν δ' ἀσπᾶσμασιν
αὐτοῖς στενάζει· κλίνεται δ' ἀνὴρ κάρα.
ὡς δ', ἥσσαν αἰεῖ, θινὴ χρίμπεται σκάφος,
χαίρειν κελεύει φιλτάτῃ τὸν φίλτατον,
ἀπαλοῖς δ' ὁμοίας λειρίοις τείνει χέρας.

G. DENMAN, M.A.

Trin. Coll. Camb. Quondam Soc.

UNIVERSITY INTELLIGENCE.

OXFORD.

The Pitt-Rivers Anthropological Museum is now partly open, and Dr. Tylor, Reader in Anthropology, is able to use it in illustration of his lectures. Of the six delivered this term, the first dealt with the development of wind-instruments, the second with that of stringed instruments, and it was shown how the harp of ancient Egypt grew up, and how similar instruments may be found in various parts of the world. Then came the lectures on the developments of boats and ships from their main originals,—the hollowed log,—the raft,—and the Egyptian boat of bulrushes covered with bitumen. The first kind produced the Phœnician and classical ship of war; and it was pointed out that the trireme, developing into the mediæval galley and the man-of-war, seems now to be passing back into its original use as a ram. The fifth lecture was on spinning and weaving, and the sixth on the garments thus produced: the Greek chiton was displayed on a lay-figure, and shown to be nearly identical with the garb of modern Egyptian women. There was a full audience throughout,—though, as in all such lectures here, it chiefly consisted of ladies.

We are to discuss next term a proposal to establish

a school of Modern Languages; the subject is to be treated philologically, and nobody to be admitted to the examination who has not satisfied the Moderators in classics. 'English' is to mean 'Early English,' as in the case of the Professorship dealing with the subject.

Mr. E. Maunde Thompson, of the British Museum, will deliver a course of eight lectures on Latin Palæography next term, twice a week, probably at 5 p.m. The Regius Professor of Greek will lecture on the History of Greek Philosophy, from the Eleatics to Socrates; and the Professor of Latin on Latin Etymology, especially as bearing on words connected with Politics, Law, Morals, and Religion. Trinity College has elected, as its President, the Rev. H. G. Woods. Mr. Woods was educated at Lancing, and came up to Oxford in 1861 as Scholar of Corpus Christi College: he was placed in the first class in Classics by the Moderators in 1863, and by the Examiners in 1865: was elected fellow of Trinity in the latter year, and was Tutor from 1866 to 1879, and Bursar from 1869 to the present time, with a short interval. He was appointed classical Moderator in 1869, and Proctor in 1877.

CAMBRIDGE.

It appears from the speech of the retiring Vice-Chancellor and the report since issued by the Financial Board, that our chief difficulty just now is want of funds. The 1877 Commission proceeded on the assumption that the colleges would by this time have been enjoying increased revenues of £25,000. As a matter of fact, the total increment is about £4500. Fortunately the Hancock bequest allows £10,000 to be appropriated to the pressing needs of the library; but some enterprises supposed necessary to put the university in a state of moderate efficiency must needs be postponed. However a fee of £1 5s. has been imposed upon candidates for the additional subjects of the previous examination, that is, on all candidates for honours.

Professor Middleton has announced a class for the study of Roman Topography and Archæology this Easter vacation at Rome. Dr. Reid has resigned the lectureship of Roman History as from midsummer next. Mr. Hadley (Pemb.), Mr. Tottenham (Joh.), Mr. Edwards (Sid.), Dr. Peile, Mr. J. Armitage Robinson (Chr.), and Mr. Goodhart (Trin.), have been appointed examiners in Part I. of the Classical Tripos. For Part II. the appointments are, in Sect. A, Mr. Moule (Corp.), and Mr. Verrall (Trin.); Sect. B, Mr. Archer Hind (Trin.), and Mr. Hicks (Trin.);

Sect. C, Dr. Reid and Mr. E. S. Thompson (Chr.); Sect. D, Prof. Middleton and Mr. Tilley (King's); Sect. E, Dr. Postgate and Mr. Neil (Pemb.)

That all energy is not consumed upon the monotonous round of lectures and examinations will be proved by the publications of the year. Mr. Verrall's *Septem* and Mr. Adam's *Apology* led the way. Mr. Roberts has his *Greek Inscriptions* nearly ready: an important work on Platonic philosophy by Dr. Jackson, and an edition of the *Timæus* by Mr. Archer Hind, are in the press. Perhaps also Mr. Frazer's translation of Pausanias may see the light this year.

An interesting conference has been held in the Senate House, to discuss the conditions of affiliating to the university the students attending its local lectures. The number of such students has doubled in the past seven years, and as the work has now gone on successfully for fourteen years, its opportune organisation under the affiliation scheme may, it is hoped, provide something of a higher education in a permanent form throughout the country. But a central fund is needed, and the syndicate propose to provide a nucleus by handing over their balance of £600, the profits on local examinations.

[For Scholarships see page 89.]

NOTES.

DEMOSTHENES, *Androt.* p. 606, § 44: ὁμῖν παρὰ τὰς εἰσφορὰς τὰς ἀπὸ Ναυσινίκου, παρ' ἰσως τάλαντα τριακόσια ἢ μικρῷ πλείω, ἔλλειμα τέτταρα καὶ δέκα ἐστὶ τάλαντα, ὧν ἑπτὰ οὗτος εἰσέπραξεν, ἐγὼ δὲ τίθημι ἅπαντα.

From this passage Boeckh infers (*P. E.* bk. iv. c. vii. p. 517, Eng. Tr.) that a property-tax producing 300 talents was actually levied in the archonship of

Nausinikos. Grote, however, (vii. p. 102 = ix. p. 333) thinks the words imply 'that a total sum of 300 talents, or thereabouts, had been levied (or called for) by all the various property-taxes imposed from the archonship of Nausinikos down to the date of the speech,' *i.e.* between B.C. 378 and 355. In this opinion he is followed by Kennedy, Whiston, and Mr. Wayte, so that his view may be regarded as the

prevailing English interpretation. Now in *Aphob.* i. p. 825, § 37 (εἰσφορὰς δ' εἰσενηνοχέται λογίζονται δοῦν δεούσας εἴκοσι μνᾶς) the amount paid by the guardians by way of property-tax during the ten years they administered the estate (B.C. 376—366) is stated at 18 minae. Demosthenes' τίμημα was 3 talents (*ib.* p. 816, § 9), so that the aggregate of taxation during this period was at the rate of 10 per cent. on the τίμημα. But the total 'rateable value' of Athens, to use a modern phrase, was about 6000 talents at this time; see *de Symmor.* p. 183, § 19, ἐπειδὴ τὸ τίμημα ἐστὶ τὸ τῆς χώρας ἑξακισχιλίων ταλάντων, cf. *ib.* p. 185, § 27. It follows, therefore, that the property-taxes between B.C. 376 and 366 produced, roughly speaking, 600 talents, and it is impossible that Demosthenes could have calculated the aggregate of the twenty-three years between B.C. 378 and 355 at 300 talents only. There is, moreover, positive evidence in the speech itself that an εἰκοστή, which, it should be remembered, would produce about 300 talents, was actually the tax which Androtion was employed to collect; see p. 617, § 77, οὐ γὰρ αὐτοὺς δεκατεύοντες οὐδέ... διπλᾶς πράττοντες τὰς εἰσφορὰς (cf. *Timocr.* p. 752, § 169) where Mr. Wayte's note is calculated to mislead, as implying that the property-tax was always an εἰκοστή, whereas of course the rate varied with the amount required from time to time. The main objection to Boeckh's view lies in ἀπό, for which Taylor proposed ἐπί, but cannot this mean 'the property-taxes produced from the year of Nausinikos,' the year being regarded as the origin or source of the revenue? Grote also lays stress on the plural number τὰς εἰσφορὰς, but surely the plural may represent the sum total paid by various contributors as well as the amount of successive imposts.

A. C. PEARSON.

NOTES ON THE SCHOLIA OF THE PLUTUS.—(1) A simple change of διατῆς to ἐξαντῆς makes sense of the hypothesis numbered IV. in Dübner and III. in Velsen: τελευταίαν δὲ διδάξαι τὴν κωμῳδίαν ταύτην ἐπὶ τῷ ἰδίῳ ὀνόματι, καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ συστήσαι Ἀραρότα ἐξαντῆς τοῖς θεαταῖς βουλόμενος, τὰ ὑπόλοιπα δύο δι' ἐκείνου καθῆκεν, Κώκαλον καὶ Αἰολοσίκωνα. 'Desiring that this should be the last play which he exhibited in his own name, and wishing to introduce at once his son Araros to the frequenters of the theatre, he entered in the name of Araros his two remaining plays, the Coccalus and the Aeolusicon.'

(2) l. 35, ἐκ τῶν στεμμάτων. The Ravenna MS. enables us to correct the scholion which appears in Dübner, p. 327b, ll. 4-9. Martin gives the Ravenna reading thus: ἐπεὶ οἱ μαντευόμενοι γγραφ. ἀνακοινῶσαι πρὸς τὸν θεὸν τὰς πεύσεις ποιοῦντο γεγραφ. . . . κτ. . . τ. κατὰ προθεσιν α. . . . τοῖς κείμενον στεφάνῳ τε ἀμφέσαντες αβρ. τῷ μαντιπο. . . ο. δὲ ἐντυχῶν συμφωνῶν τοῖς προ. . . νομοῖς τὴν ἀπο. p. . . . επ. . . . ε. ἐξ ἂν δυτο. . . δια τριποδῶν ἐριτ. It seems to me that this may best be restored as follows: ἐπεὶ οἱ μαντευόμενοι ἐγγράφῳ ἀνακοινῶσαι πρὸς τὸν θεὸν τὰς πεύσεις ποιοῦντο γεγραφότες ἐν πυκτίῳ τῷ κατὰ πρόθεσιν ἐν αὐτοῖς κειμένῳ, στεφάνῳ τε ἀμφέσαντες παρέδωκαν τῷ μαντιπόλῳ, οὗτος δὲ ἐντυχῶν σύμφωνον τοῖς προτεινόμενοις τὴν ἀπόκρισιν ἐποιεῖτο 'ἐξ αὐτοῖο διὰ τριποδῶν ἐριτίμων' [*Ej.* 1016]. 'For men who consulted an oracle inquired of the god by means of a communication in writing. Having written their questions on a tablet purposely placed in the shrine, and putting a wreath round the tablet they delivered it to the divining priest; and he read it, and in accordance with the questions proposed gave his answer "from the shrine by means of tripods revered."' If ἐν αὐτοῖς is rightly restored, it is certainly strange that V should have αὐτοῖς, which would suggest either that the scholion in V came from R,

or that the scholion in both cases was copied from the same MS., into R with more, into V with less care. Under the αβρ [ἀβρῶ] a verb is concealed, perhaps παρέδωκαν. V supplies the lost verb by ἐχειροτόνουν placed after μαντιπόλῳ. The variants τῇ μαντιπόλῳ and ἡ δὲ ἐντυχούσα are doubtless due to some one who wished to specialise the explanation to Delphi. Note the late sense of ἐντυχάνειν.

(3) l. 84, ὅστις ἔνεκε τῆς φειδωλίας οὐδένα εἶα προσ-ἵεσθαι φυλακῆς ἔνεκεν τῶν χρημάτων καὶ γλίσχρου βίου (Dübner, p. 329a, 51-53. Martin, p. 6) purports to be a quotation from the Pelargi. I would suggest that ἔνεκε τῆς φειδωλίας is a gloss upon φυλακῆς ἔνεκεν, and that the lines ran perhaps thus

ὅστις οὐδέν' οἱ
εἶα προσέσθαι, [φασί,] φυλακῆς εἶνεκα,
ὦν χρημάτων [μάλιστα] καὶ γλίσχρος βίου,

'Who suffered no man, they say, to make up to him, for precaution's sake, being very grasping of money and substance.'—W. GUNION RUTHERFORD.

RUTILIUS CLAUDIUS NAMATIUS, II. 47, 8:

'Visceribus nudis armatum condidit hostem
Illatae cladis liberiore dolo.'

THE subject to *condidit* is Stilicho, who admitted the Goths by compact into the 'viscera' of Latium. The second line stands as I have written it in all editions. It is interpreted thus: 'by a wile more free from danger than the wile of an openly inflicted disaster,' i.e. it was safer for Stilicho to use against his country the wile of a compact with the Goths than the wile of a direct attack. There is much difficulty here. The natural senses of *illatae cladis* and *liberiore* are warped in a strange fashion; and an *illata clades* could not be called a *dolus*. Is it not obvious that in the line as Rutilius wrote it there was an allusion to the Trojan horse? There are similar mythological allusions in the context. *Illatae* is a blunder for *Iliacae*. Whether the error was in the lost codex, or in the transcript of a codex Bobiensis made by Inghirami in 1494, from which all existing MSS. are derived, is hard to say. If the commonly accepted idea be true that the codex was written in the Langobardic minuscule of the Carolingian epoch, the error was probably in the codex itself, since *Iliacae* in that particular script could hardly even by extreme negligence be mistaken for *illatae*. The word *liberiore* has taken the place of some other comparative, which if the possibilities be considered can be no other than *deteriore*. The Langobardic *d* has a long upstroke, and if the first part of the letter were faintly written or obliterated, it would easily be mistaken for *l*. The peculiar Langobardic *l* is not unlike some forms of the Italian *r* and *b*. Inghirami might therefore easily mistake *deteriore* for *leveriore* or *lecriore*, which he would then naturally correct to *liberiore*. The line '*Iliacae cladis deteriore dolo*' will then mean 'by a wile more wicked than that which brought disaster on Troy.' For *dolus* compare Plautus, *Pseudolus*, 1244, Fleck, 'superavit dolum Troianum atque Vlixem Pseudolus.'—J. S. R.

ON THE DERIVATION OF THE LATIN WORD 'TITULUS.'—So far as my research has gone, no derivation has yet been discovered for this word. *Ti*, followed by *t*, suggests reduplication; but the word, as it stands, seems to exclude any such view. *Ulus* suggests a diminutive; but *titulus* could only be 'little Titus,' which it certainly does not mean.

As to its meaning, Professor Skeat (under 'Title') explains *titulus* as 'superscription on a tomb or altar,'

referring to Gk. *τιμή*.¹ But it is not only 'on a tomb or altar,' but upon many other things, a banner, or a building of any kind, a *pittacium*, ticket, or docket of any sort, that a *titulus* may be written or graven; above all, it is used by the Romans, as *title* is by us, to describe a book or *volumen*, probably also any part of a book, and this use (there is no reason to doubt) was as early as any of its other uses.

In the course of last year, dipping into Rabelais (for the sake of his old French, not of his matter), I came across the phrase '*tiltre au dessus*,' the *title* above (the heading of the page). How came this *l* into the word? I asked myself; and it occurred to me forthwith that it came from *stilus*; and if so, that *titulus* is a derivative of *stilus*. The more I have considered this matter, the more strong has become my conviction that this, and none other, is the origin of *titulus*,—the *stilus* above the *stilus*, that which is written above to explain that which stands below in a book. Thence it became a brief *description* generally, however and wherever written, however and wherever spoken as our dictionaries tell us.

Some friends have suggested that the *l* of *tiltre* arises by metathesis from the *l* of *titulus*, and cite a Spanish word in which some such transposition occurs. I do not think the two cases alike: but this does not concern me much, for I do not adduce *tiltre* as a proof, but only as that which brought *stilus* to my mind, and so induced the train of thought which led me to conviction.

There are two ways in which we may suppose *stilus* to produce *titulus*: in both we strike off *s* which is lost (as in *torus*, *taurus*, *togo*) by so many words. about 100 in number, beginning with *s* and a second consonant. This leaves *tilus*; reduplication gives *titilus*, from which to *titulus* is only the same step as from *minimus* to *minumus*. This seems better than to imagine a diminutive² *titulus* converted by assimilation (*t-t*) to *titulus*. That reduplication has sometimes a diminishing use, appears from such words as *cicindela*, *cincinnus*.

In any case I think that *titulus* is a derivative of *stilus*; and that, as *stilus* (the instrument of writing, *γραφεῖον*, graver or pen) was used by a metonymy, to express the matter written (whence in English, *style*), so *titulus* was first used to express the small matter, by which the greater was summarised, whether in a brief heading, or in any other descriptive form.

B. H. KENNEDY.

[The above note was submitted to two scholars who have made a special study of etymology. Their opinions are given below.]

Stilus, originally 'stake,' stands for *studus*, cf. Ags. *studu* 'post,' and Eng. *stud*. The reduplicated form would be *stitulus*. Loss of initial *s* before *t* in Latin is allowed by Stolz in *togo tergeo tono torus trio tundo turba turdus*, and by Brugmann himself in *togo* and *tundo*; *taurus* is less likely. Bugge's connexion of *titubo* with Eng. *stoop* is an exact parallel to that of *titulus* with *stilus*. The old *u* of *stilus* would be preserved in *titulus*, because the latter was taken as a diminutive. But does *stilus* ever mean 'the written matter'?—E. R. W.

¹ Since this was written I find that Professor Skeat has followed Corssen (*Krit. Brit.* 373), who refers not only *titulus*, but *timor*, to *τιμή*! This idea is justly set aside by Curtius (*Gr. Etym.* 481).

² I prefer the form diminutive.

It cannot be safely assumed that *s* was lost from initial *st* within the Latin language. Loss of *s* in (s)*togo* (and similar doublet forms in different languages) took place, not in Latin, but in Ind.-Eur. Otherwise we might get *titulus* from *sti-tel-us*, a reduplicated form from root *stel*; cf. *steti*, *spopondi*, *seicidi* (the old form given by Priscian, I. vi. 30). But certain examples of such initial loss in Latin are not to hand.—J. P.

CAN there be any reason why Liddell and Scott (ed. 7) should assign to *ἐπισήμασι* in Cic. *Att.* xiv. 3, 2, a different meaning ('suffrage, voting') from that which it has in Cic. *Att.* i. 16, 11, *i.e.* 'indications of feeling' in the way of applause, or hooting at the theatre?—A. S. WILKINS.

RECENT editors with one accord accept the conjecture of Salmasius in Plaut. *Mil. Gl.* 695, *toraria* for the vulgate *ceraria*, on the strength of a gloss in which it is found explained by *ὠλενοτρόφος*. One would like to find some passage in which *torus* is so far equivalent to *ὠλένη* as to lend any support to this identification. 'Muscle-woman' is not a natural expression for a nurse whose duty is to bear an infant in her arms. The reading of A. *ceraria* does not favour the conjecture.—A. S. WILKINS.

THE MAUSOLEUM.—Claude Guichard's story of the destruction of the Mausoleum at Halicarnassos by the Knights of Rhodes is now well known from the reprints by Sainte Croix, Ross, Newton, Herquet, and others. It is briefly this. Just before the invasion of Rhodes by Sultan Sulaiman in 1522, some knights were sent over to put the castle at Halicarnassos into repair. In looking about for stone, they chanced on the pyramidal summit of the Mausoleum, and as they dug down, they discovered a cavernous entrance. Within there was a square chamber surrounded with sculpture in relief, and beyond it another chamber containing a tomb with a vase and an inscription. On returning next morning they found the tomb broken open, by corsairs as they thought, and fragments of gold scattered round. This is mainly a new version of the old story in Muhammad Abd Allah ibn Abd al-Hakim of the forcing of the Great Pyramid of Ghizeh by the Khalif al-Mamûn, Harûn ar-Raschid's son. Hewing a cavernous entrance in the side, the Arabs came to a chamber beyond which was another containing a tomb with a body wearing a golden breastplate; and there was also a vase and an inscription. Two additions have been made. First, the sculpture in relief, suggested by the slabs of the frieze built into the castle walls. Secondly, the intervention of the corsairs, suggested by the attack on the knights by the Seljûk lord of Mylasa during the building of the castle; as to which see Ducas. Guichard says he had the story from d'Alechamps, who had it from de la Tourrette, one of the knights sent over to Halicarnassos in 1522. The remains of the Mausoleum had been used for the castle long before: Fontanus, who was judge of appeal at Rhodes in 1522, says this was done a century ago. Is it possible that the incredibly sagacious hounds which kept watch at Halicarnassos for the knights were really the marble lions from the Mausoleum built into the castle walls? The pilgrims who mention these hounds (Ghisteles, Breydenbach, Tschudi, and others) had not seen them; but had merely heard of them at Rhodes, Halicarnassos lying off the pilgrims' track.—CECIL TORR.

REPORTS

ARCHAEOLOGY.

(*Acquisitions of British Museum, continued from page 27.*)

A SERIES OF PAINTED VASES OBTAINED BY MR. W. R. PATON IN THE ISLAND OF KALYMNOS.—In a recent letter to me Mr. Paton writes as follows: 'The vases, I am informed, were all found together at a site which has been pointed out to me, close to Pothia, the modern town on the hill which bounds the valley on the west.¹ They were found accidentally, and no further researches have been made there. I have been shown small vases of the same class (*Bügelkanne*), which have been found lower down the hill near the bed of the stream. I am assured that the two small cameos which I gave last year to the British Museum, and which I obtained from the same source, were found together with these vases. The former owner is quite positive on this point. Nothing else found together with them has been preserved. 'I am sorry I have no more precise information: it is now five or six years since the discovery took place, and no one paid much attention to it at the time.'

The 'two small cameos' to which Mr. Paton refers above are as follows: (1) Onyx cameo of two very thin layers, white on yellowish colour; a female figure advancing towards a male with lyre (?), taking him by the left shoulder and right arm; (2) Similar, a nude female (*Europa*?) riding to right on bull(?), holding drapery which flies in crescent form over her head. As these are of distinctly late Greek, if not of Roman work, it was rather a shock to meet them in company with 'prehistoric' pottery and nothing else. But Mr. Paton in a subsequent letter (Feb. 2, 1887) tells me 'I discovered at Kalymnos that the two onyx cameos were found in the immediate neighbourhood of the vases, but not with them; which ends the difficulty.' For reasons which are furnished by the vases themselves I am inclined to think this series, excepting possibly the first six, are certainly the latest examples yet known of their class. The first six in my list given below are of lighter-coloured clay and more finished work, while the decorations are not different from the ordinary types of Ialysos. The remainder, however, have all the appearance of a degenerating style. Well-known forms are indeed suggested, but are either improved upon (as Nos. 8-9) or else conventionalised (as No. 15); in fact in No. 7 the decoration suggests nothing so much as the *bandité* of Cyprus. It is much to be regretted that we have not precise information as to the finding of this interesting series, as to the mode of sepulture, character and size of tomb, and as to other objects which the tomb or tombs may have contained: for I think they open up a new chapter in the history of pre-Hellenic pottery.

In the descriptions which follow, I have referred, wherever a comparison is possible, to the vases published in Furtwaengler and Loescheke, *Mykenische Vasen*, especially to the shapes given in plate xlv.

1. *Bügelkanne* (shape 51), brown bands on light drab; ht. 11½ in.

2. *Bügelkanne* (shape 51, but slopes straight from

shoulder to foot), on shoulder ornament exactly similar to that on No. 272; ht. 3¾ in.

3. Cup with two handles (shape 76); ornament very similar to No. 222, dark brown and drab; ht. 4 in. diam. 5¾ in.

4. Cup, similar to preceding; ornament same as No. 242, light brown; ht. 4 in. diam. 5¾ in.

5. Vase (shape 33); ornament like upper half of a leaf between two sets of vertical lines, bright red on drab; ht. 5¾ in. diam. 6¾ in.

6. Similar vase; ornament in dark brown on drab; ht. 4 in. diam. 5½ in.

7. Large orange-shaped vase (similar to shape 27, but without lip and different handles); on shoulder four horizontal handles, two below, twisted, and pierced horizontally at points of insertion, and two halfway between on an upper level. The shoulder is divided into three friezes by parallel bands; in the top frieze sets of zigzags; in middle, sets of concentric half circles; in lowest, *obv.* two stags confronting stag and goat, in the middle, a palm-tree; *rev.* two stags confronting two stags, in middle, similar tree. The bodies of the animals have the outline filled in with dots, the necks, with hatched lines (quite unlike any type in *Myk. Vas.*; the animals in No. 416b are somewhat similar, but certainly earlier in style); ht. 21½ in.

8. *Kalathos* with two horizontal handles (new shape, the nearest is 78): on the exterior, plain bands, on interior, frieze of spiral patterns, brownish red on reddish ground: on the interior, at each point where the insertion of the handles comes, are three raised knobs, as if suggesting rivets; ht. 6 in. diam. 11 in.

9. *Kalathos* in every way similar to preceding, except the interior decoration, which consists of a frieze of two waterbirds, four dolphins, and a large floral ornament (cf. pl. v.); ht. 6 in. diam. 11½ in.

10. Beaker (shape 96), dark reddish brown with light band in centre; ht. 6 in. diam. 7 in.

11. *Bügelkanne* (shape 50), spout wanting; light red bands on body; on shoulder a frieze with a tongue-shaped ornament, a cheek pattern (cf. No. 341) and a scale pattern (cf. No. 333); all light red on reddish ground; ht. 6½ in.

12. Ditto (same shape and colours), palmette, and spiral band (cf. No. 131); ht. 5½ in.

13. Ditto, Ditto, leaf pattern; ht. 4 in.

14. Cup (shape 87), broad wavy line round body; ht. 3 in. diam. 5¾ in.

15. Cup (shape 80) very heavy coarse red pottery; ht. 5 in. diam. 6½ in.

16. Cup (shape 84); on *obv.* conventionalised cuttle-fish red on reddish yellow; the *rev.* is undecorated; ht. 7¾ in.

17. Amphora (shape 43), black wavy lines and handles each terminating in three downward stripes; ht. 13 in.

18. Amphora (shape 37), similar decoration; ht. 10½ in.

19. *Kernos* of four vases (shape 33), conjoined with large arching handle, broken (shape 117); decoration dark brown or light unglazed red; beneath

¹ See Newton, *Travels*, i. p. 285, who, speaking of Kalymnos, says, 'the modern harbour, now called Pothia, on the eastern coast.' In Ross, *Reisen*, ii. this is marked on his map, simply as 'Hafen,' and the town on the hill as 'Stadt.'

base of each vase are sets of diagonal lines; ht. $2\frac{1}{2}$ in.

20. Simpulum (shape 102 without foot), coarse red clay; ht. $4\frac{1}{2}$ in.

A SERIES OF ANTIQUITIES FOUND TOGETHER IN A TOMB NEAR SESTO CALENDE, LAGO MAGGIORE.

Vase of black ware (bucchero), ornamented with incised patterns and containing ashes.

Cup on tall foot, plain (bucchero).

Aryballos, plain (bucchero).

Two bronze fibulae, part of a large armilla and of a bronze chain.

(To be continued.)

ANTIOCH.—In the *Times* of January 3 Mr. Greville Chester called attention to the destruction of ancient remains at Antioch. We have reason to believe that the worst injuries were inflicted in the time of Ibrahim Pasha of Egypt; and that, partly in consequence of Mr. Chester's letter, the Turkish authorities will in future exercise a benevolent supervision in these matters.—[C. S.]

EXCAVATIONS AT ASSARLIK.—I have received a very important series of notes from Mr. W. R. Paton of excavations and researches which he has been for some time carrying on in the neighbourhood of Myndus on the coast of Caria. These notes will shortly be published in full, together with the necessary illustrations, in the *Hellenic Journal*, but meanwhile I should like to take the earliest opportunity of indicating briefly the general scope of these discoveries, which throw a very important new light on the increasingly interesting question of the pre-Hellenic races of Asia Minor.

Mr. Newton (*Hist. Disc.* pp. 580 sq.) mentions a series of tombs close by the Akropolis of Assarlik, which he identified with the ancient Souagela; Mr. Paton, however, adduces reasons to show that Assarlik is probably a minor site in the district of Termira (Chifoot Kale), rather than that of Souagela, the importance of which we know from the Athenian tribute lists.¹

Near this site Mr. Paton opened a quantity of tombs, upon a ridge facing the Akropolis to the south-east, the contents of some of which are now in the British Museum. These tombs were of two kinds, viz.:

(i.) A circular wall of polygonal masonry, about thirty feet in diameter, on which are piled loose stones forming the tumulus: in the centre a sepulchral chamber closed at top by two large stones, and entered by dromos to north-west, roofed with large rectangular stones and with walls of polygonal masonry: the door is formed of a rectangular block as lintel resting on two others as sideposts.

(ii.) A rectangular enclosure formed by a single course of polygonal masonry, with no trace of a tomb, but occasionally enclosing a small superficial cavity lined with four slabs of terra-cotta, and covered with a large circular stone; containing only ashes. Lower down the hill these characteristics interchange; some rectangles having large sepulchres which have contained a sarcophagus or a *pitthos*, the few circles containing only small *ostothekai*.

Mr. Paton thinks these tombs on or near high summits are those which Strabo says were pointed out in Caria as the work of the Leleges (see Newton, *loc. cit.*). 'The same mode of burial in combination with geometric designs is found in Italian tombs of

the early iron age (*Bullet. scr. Romana*, i. p. 158) and possibly elsewhere. I should think that the Leleges were primitive inhabitants both in Greece and Asia Minor, and that they did not emigrate from the latter through the islands. There is no evidence that they were a seafaring people like the Carians. The two undoubtedly Lelegian towns of Pedasus are both inland, and if we can dismiss the Cretan account given by Herodotus, there is no trace of them in the islands except Chios and Samos. The island tombs seem to belong to quite a different people. The tumuli at old Smyrna, which I have not yet visited, seem to resemble in construction those of Assarlik. Perhaps they are tombs of the same people, as Strabo mentions Leleges in the neighbourhood of Smyrna.'

It seems probable that the Assarlik system of sepulchral architecture survived long among these people, for on a ridge near the village of Gheresi Mr. Paton saw two tombs of this style, of which the entrances lead out of a semicircular wall built into the face of the hill looking west: here he found many fragments of black and red glazed pottery. On the adjoining summit is a very remarkable tomb, surrounded at a distance of about eight metres by a wall, and roofed by five enormous stones. The whole is encircled by a second wall, distant twenty-four metres down hill; and opposite the entrance of the tomb is a gate. In it were some fragments of marble which had possibly formed part of a door or of a sarcophagus, and a small fragment of an Attic vase of the fifth century. 'I should be inclined to think from its magnificence and conspicuous position it was a tomb of one of those Karian princes mentioned in the Athenian tribute lists. At any rate it is much later than the tumuli of Assarlik.'

Mr. Paton deduces the following results from the objects which he has found, and which are now in the British Museum:—

I. No trace of any but geometric design.

(i.) All vases which have painted decorations have horizontal bands alone or in combination with large concentric circles or segments of circles (except one with zigzag pattern).

(ii.) Impressed patterns on larger vessels zigzag or wavy.

(iii.) Same system on gold.

II. Forms of vases have little in common with Mycenaean, and have not the variety of that class.

III. The fibulae are all of one pattern.

IV. Weapons all iron.

V. Bodies in all cases burnt.

Of the class of objects which Mr. Paton found, a sufficient idea will be given by quoting here the contents of two tombs. In the first were:—

A. (i.) A large amphora, nearly circular, with nearly vertical handles, filled with bones and ashes.

(ii.) A bowl with two handles, plain drab.

(iii.) A jug, plain drab.

(iv.) An amphora with patterns of concentric circles.

(v.) Fragments of iron weapons, including a lance-head and a curved knife.

In the second were:—

B. (i.) A cinerary vase as in A.

(ii.) Fragments of a thin curved plate of bronze, which has been attached to wood.

(iii.) Two gold spirals (for the hair?).

(iv.) Fragments of iron weapons.

Among the other objects from these tombs may specially be noted:—(i.) An elektron circular bulla (2 in. diam.), the upper part curled over for attachment, and with holes for attachment all round the

¹ Mr. Newton, who has read Mr. Paton's arguments, points out, *per contra*, the striking importance of the position of Assarlik from a strategical point of view.

edge, which is recurved; with a circular boss *repoussé* in the centre, and patterns of triangles filled with stippled dots. (ii.) A bandeau of gold plate, 3 in. by 1½ in., with double row of zigzags; cf. *Arch. Zeit.* 1884, Taf. 9, 4. (iii.) Several bronze fibulae of form similar to *ibid.* Taf. 9, 3, without the side plate. (iv.) A series of fragments of terra-cotta sarcophagi with incised and stamped designs.

The importance of these discoveries cannot be over-estimated in their bearing on the early history of the 'Geometric' races; everything goes to prove that the products of the Assarlik graves are exclusively local; clay, bronze (or copper), iron, and gold, that is all, and the only decoration, as Mr. Paton remarks, is geometric; while the vases are all wheel-made, they are as a rule coarse in texture, and of the simplest forms,¹ and being insufficiently baked have unfortunately lost much of the surface. No idols, nor any traces of representation of human or even of animal figures, if we except the askos. Nothing which can be considered as imported; the whole series, in fact, seems to speak of an inland folk of a very archaic period, subject to little outside influence, but with a fairly advanced culture, if we may judge from the beautifully-worked fibulae. They add one more link to the connexion between the early Italian sites and the inland sites of Lydia and Caria. The rich series of patterns on the fragments of Mr. Paton's sarcophagi compare with nothing so well as the archaic Corneto find in *Mon. Ined.* X. x.²; and Furtwaengler has pointed out, *loc. cit.* p. 99, that the geometric gold bandeaux show a strong similarity with the impressed reliefs on Rhodian pithi, and so with the impressed reliefs on the Bucchero vases of Italy. There is yet one more point of connexion. The only pottery which I know of as resembling the Assarlik vases is a series of fragments in the British Museum from Sardes. In 1869 Mr. Dennis made a tentative excavation at Bintepe ('thousand hills'): he succeeded in finding one of these tumuli in an apparently intact state, but before he could succeed in penetrating through the solid core of masonry in the interior of the tumulus he was compelled for want of funds to bring his operations to a close: the fragments of vases which we now possess were the only fruits of his expedition. In the Berlin *Abhandl.* for 1858, p. 539, v. Olfers describes a thorough exploration of one of these Grabhügel by Herr Spiegelthal. The tomb he found is certainly of later date than those of Assarlik, but a distinct development of the same system. The one Dennis attacked was apparently an earlier one of the same series, and the fragments from it bear a marked similarity to the Assarlik series. If the early sites of Lydia and Caria could be more fully explored, we should probably be in a better position to judge of the early history of the Italian races.

CECIL SMITH.

DELPHI.—Ever since 1862, when Foucart and Wescher continued on a larger scale the excavations begun at Delphi by C. O. Müller, it has been understood that the complete excavation of the site would some day be undertaken by France. In 1880 M. Haussoullier continued the work, and found, besides hundreds of inscriptions belonging to the inscribed wall of the peribolos, the now celebrated portico of the fifth century (de quo vide *Bull. Corr. Hellén.*) The difficulties which stood in the way of more systematic

excavations were: 1. the necessity of expropriating the modern village of Castri, which is built on the ruins of the Delphian temple; 2. a certain reluctance of the Greeks, which already expressed itself in 1875, when the Germans asked their permission for digging at Olympia.

Now, the chief obstacles have been removed. An agreement between prime minister Tricoupis and the French minister Count Montholon, has been established on the terms of the permission granted to the Germans in 1875, viz. that all the discoveries are to remain in Greece, and the French school at Athens, entrusted with the diggings, is to possess during five years the exclusive right of publishing, taking casts, &c. A law will be presented by M. Tricoupis to the Greek parliament in order to insure the removal of the small houses which compose the village of Castri. The excavations will begin as soon as possible. It is understood that they will be conducted by M. Foucart, director of the school, with M. Haussoullier as chief assistant, and the other members of the school as overseers.—SALOMON REINACH.

NISYROS.—In the *Ἀμαθεία* (Smyrna) of January 21, and also in the *Ἐφήμερις* (Athens) of January 20, is published a marble inscription recently found in this island. It is an honorary decree, of which seventeen lines are preserved, recording the name of a certain Gnomagoras, son of Dorotheos a Nisyrian, the various services he had rendered to the island, and the honours which had been conferred on him by the *βουλή* and the various *κοινεῖα*. It is specially mentioned that he had seen service in a light cruiser named '*Εὐανδρία Σεβαστά*,' and that in his capacity of gymnasiarch he had furnished oil at his own cost to all those who took part in the games.—[C. S.]

PATMOS.—In *Blackwood*, March 1887, Mr. J. T. Bent describes a visit to this island. He gives an interesting account of some of the more noteworthy books in the monastery, and of some curious customs which still survive among the Patmiotes, especially noticing the veneration with which the cave of St. John is still regarded.—[C. S.]

FURNI.—In *Longman's Magazine*, March 1887, Mr. J. T. Bent describes four islets near Samos, named as he thinks after certain rock-cut tombs. Unfortunately his archaeological researches here last year were cut short by the arrival of a pirate caïque, whose evil intentions were with difficulty frustrated.—[C. S.]

SMYRNA.—I recently visited the Necropolis of Old Smyrna, and noticed that all the tombs on the lower slopes of the hill had been in recent years opened by treasure-grubbers. These tombs are sunk perpendicularly in the ground, and are without entrances, but so far imitate the more ancient tumuli higher up in the neighbourhood of the so-called tomb of Tantalus that they are surrounded by stone circles. Numerous fragments of pithoi and terra-cotta sarcophagi were lying about. I picked up one small portion of the rim of a sarcophagus, which is ornamented in the same way as those from Clazomenae. It has a guilloche pattern with a double fringe of palmettes. Where the guilloche terminates is a double row of squares, running across the rim. There is a precisely similar fragment from Clazomenae in the museum at Smyrna, which shows that this chequer pattern, like the meander on another sarcophagus (*Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1883, p. 10) separates the figure paintings from the remaining portion of the rim. The traces of colour are bright red and white, the red being laid on the top of the white.

¹ With two exceptions, viz. (i.) A bugelkanne, decorated with segments of concentric circles; the spout is joined at the top to the handle, and at the insertion of the outer part of the handle a hole is pierced. (ii.) A bird-shaped askos, very similar to the horseshaped one in *Mon. Ined.* X. x., with decorations of spirals.

² Cf. also the description of the Vetulonia "tomb of the warrior" quoted in the *American Journal*, 1886, p. 492.

It is much to be desired that some attempt should be made to find and preserve other such sarcophagi which may yet exist.

Remains of early Greek art from this site would have a peculiar value, as they must date from before the Lydian conquest.—W. R. PATON.

VOLO.—The following statement, of which the archaeology appears somewhat hazy, is taken from the *Evening Standard*, March 11 :—‘The excavations that are being made in the prehistoric tombs here

have resulted in several very interesting discoveries. A considerable number of small *objets d'art* in gold and porcelain, probably of Egyptian origin, have been found. It is conjectured that the bodies of the dead were burned with their ornaments, except certain of the more valuable articles, which were afterwards placed in the tomb. Round one of the tombs is a seat, and the bricks of which this is constructed have evidently been burned, a point of some interest in the history of architecture.’—[C. S.]

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the EDITOR of the CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—I cannot expect that you will allow me space to examine in detail Mr. Sidgwick's extraordinary travesty of the *Quarterly* scheme for a School of English Literature which appeared in your last number, but I trust you will permit me to correct two or three of his most glaring mis-statements, and to repudiate the nonsense which he has so unfairly attributed to me.

1. He ridicules my excluding from the curriculum of literary study all Cicero's treatises, all the Platonic Dialogues and the *Republic*, while including such trash as the *Hymnus Tejunantium* of Prudentius. A reference to the *Quarterly* (p. 261) will show that the *De Oratore* and the *Brutus* are among the books expressly prescribed as text-books; that so far from the *Republic* being excluded it is expressly stated that no student should be admitted to an honour degree in arts who had not an adequate acquaintance with it (*Quarterly*, p. 259), and that so far from all the Platonic Dialogues being excluded, the *Phaedrus* and the *Phaedo*, described as works absolutely indispensable to the student of poetry, have a foremost place in the proposed curriculum. As for the introduction of the *Hymnus Tejunantium* it is a pure fiction of Mr. Sidgwick's imagination. Mr. Sidgwick is much too well-read a scholar not to know that when Prudentius is alluded to, he is alluded to not as the author of the *Hymnus Tejunantium*, but as the author of the *Psychomachia*, of the historical interest of which as a link between classical and modern literature Mr. Sidgwick must be perfectly aware.

2. Mr. Sidgwick twice ridicules my including *Silius Italicus* among the books proposed for the curriculum of study. I never even alluded to *Silius Italicus*. Nor is there anything in my article which could by any possibility be twisted into an allusion to him. The assertion is a pure invention of Mr. Sidgwick's.

3. I am accused of the absurdity of including in the proposed curriculum “the 1,400 pages of the *Corpus Poetarum*,” and “some at least of the Alexandrine didactics.” This also is pure fiction. Of the poets comprised in the *Corpus Poetarum* I never suggested that any but the leading and master classics should be read except in extracts, and these extracts taken in their entirety, amounted only to a few hundred lines. To the “Alexandrine didactics” I made no reference at all.

4. Mr. Sidgwick asserts that the scheme which he criticises would exclude from a school of *Belles Lettres* the writings of Wycliffe, Malory, More, Ascham, Sidney, Hooker, Bacon, Burton, Milton's prose works, Hobbes, Locke, much of Taylor, Barrow, South, Bunyan, Addison, Swift, &c. &c. He might have observed with equal reason that as the letters of the alphabet were not specified in the scheme they also would be excluded. If Mr. Sidgwick will turn again to the *Quarterly* article he will see that the history of English Literature forms as important a part of the proposed course as the critical study of prescribed works.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

J. C. COLLINS.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Athenaeum: 29 Jan.: Rev. J. Welldon's *Rhetoric of Aristotle*. 12 Feb.: Jebb's *Homer*. 26 Feb.: excellent review (continued in next number) of the English translation of Mommsen's *Roman History*, vol. v., and review of S. S. Laurie's *Lectures on the Rise and Early Constitution of Universities*. 12 Mar.: review of B. V. Head's *Historia Nummorum*. 19 Mar.: Paley's *Gospel of St. John*; a *Verbatim Translation of the Vatican MS.*

Academy: 22 Jan.: Notices. Glazebrook's *Medea*; Sidgwick's *Greek Prose Composition*; and other school-books; two books on *Modern Latin Verse*, (R. Ellis); Schrader's *Linguistisch-historische Forschungen zur Handelsgeschichte und Warenkunde* Pt. 1; A. F. Pott's *Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft*, and Karl Abel's *Aegyptische Sprachstudien*. 29 Jan.: Beloch's *Die Bevölkerung der griechisch-römischen Welt*, (F. T. Richards); Leaf's *Iliad*, 1-12, (F. Haverfield). 5 Feb.: G. T. Stokes' *Ireland and the Celtic Church to the English*

Conquest in 1172, (R. Dunlop); W. Cunningham's *St. Austin*; V. H. Stanton's *Jewish and Christian Messiah*; two editions of Juvenal (A. S. Wilkins). Feb. 12: E. Vischer's *Offenbarung Johannis*, (R. B. Drummond); Mommsen's *History of Rome. The Provinces*, trans. by W. P. Dickson; Arnold's *Second Punic War*, edited by W. T. Arnold; Bouché-Leclercq's *Manuel des Institutions Romaines*; E. Morlot's *Précis des Institutions politiques de Rome*; P. Willems' *Les Elections Municipales à Pompéi*; W. Soltau's *Prolegomena zu einer Römischen Chronologie*; Duruy's *History of Rome*; Correspondence on the *Date and History of the Latin Bible of Monte Amiata*, by the Bishop of Salisbury; (19 Feb.) W. Sanday, *Martin Rule*; (26 Feb.) F. J. A. Hort, *Bishop of Salisbury*, H. J. White, *Martin Rule*. Feb. 19: Brugmann's *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, by A. H. Sayce. Feb. 26: Duncker's *History of Greece*, vol. ii. (F. T. Richards); Quicherat's *Mélanges d'Archéo-*

logie et d'Histoire, (J. H. Middleton). [*Codex Amiatinus*: The main points in this interesting correspondence are as follows: The generally-received account of the *Codex Amiatinus* at Florence, one of the chief authorities for the text of Jerome's *Vulgate*, was that it was written by a certain Servandus, whose name appears at the beginning of Leviticus, and who was identified with a deacon of that name who visited Benedict at Monte Casino in 541. On the back of fol. 1 is an inscription in Latin verse recording the gift of the *Codex* to the convent of Monte Amiata by Peter, abbot of a Lombard monastery. Some words in this inscription had been erased and altered. Last year De Rossi suggested that the *Codex* was that which Bede tells us Ceolfrid took with him from England as an offering to the Church of Rome in the year 716, and conjectured that one of the altered lines, now beginning *Lan-gobardorum*, had originally begun *Ceolfridus Britonum*. Accordingly he made the age of the *Codex* 150 years later than had been supposed. The Bishop of Salisbury, to whom we are indebted for this information, also mentions that Dr. Peter Corssen had pointed out certain resemblances between the *Cod. Am.* and the Bible given by Cassiodorus to the monastery of Vivarium which was written about 541.

Dr. Hort discovers, in an anonymous life of Ceolfrid from which Bede took his account, a description of the Bible taken to Rome in 716, giving the Latin inscription in its original form. The true reading of the line emended by De Rossi turns out to be *Ceolfridus Anglorum*. It further states that Ceolfrid had brought from Rome in an earlier visit a Latin Bible of the prae-hieronymian translation, and that he had three copies made in England of the new translation, one of which he took back as an offering to the Church of Rome. Dr. Hort further proves by quotations from some of Bede's smaller works that the old Bible brought from Rome was a copy of that of Cassiodorus, and thinks that the Servandus mentioned may have been the writer of the original from which the *Cod. Am.* was copied. Canon Raine suggests that Bede himself may have been the copyist, as there is a MS. of Cassiodorus *super Psalterium* in the Durham Library, which is said to be *de manu Bede*.]

Expositor, March, 1887. Prof. A. B. Davidson has an interesting paper on the stand-point of the prophet Amos. Prof. Strack writing on Bible Revision in Germany mentions the strong feeling against any but the mildest revision of Luther's Bible, and gives a list of the chief critiques of the *Protestant Bible* up to the present time. The revision of the Old Testament seems to have been much bolder than that of the New Testament, the number of 'real alterations' being eighty for the latter and 3,000 for the former, besides 1,000 for the Apocrypha. The great fault of the revision is that the text used for the New Testament is the Erasmus of 1519; but complaint is also made of the style of the translation on the ground of inelegance and unintelligibility. The reviewer, however, commends the work on the whole, and hopes that the revisers will not be deterred from making further improvements by the outcry which has been raised against them. There are also papers by Sir J. W. Dawson on the Rivers of Eden, and by Prof. Rendel Harris on Dr. Sanday's view of the origin of the Christian Ministry.

The following articles on classical subjects have appeared in other magazines:—

Blackwood (March): Revelations from Patmos, by J. T. Bent. *English Historical Review* (Jan.):

The Empress Theodora, by C. E. Mallet, pp. 1-20; The Roman Province of Dacia, by T. Hodgkin; Lysurgus, the Legislator, by J. Adams. *Journal of Education* (Feb.): Rev. of Jevons' History of Greek Literature. (March): G. G. Ramsay's Selections from Tibullus and Propertius. *Nineteenth Century* (March): The Greater Gods of Olympus; I. Poseidon, by W. E. Gladstone. *The Quarterly* (No. 327): Nauratis and the Greeks in Egypt. *Scottish Review* (Jan.): Byzantinism and Hellenism, by D. Bikelas. *Scribner's Magazine* (Feb.): The Likenesses of Julius Caesar, by J. C. Ropes.

The *Church Quarterly Review*, Jan. 1887. An article on 'Egyptian Christianity' shows from Mr. Le Page Renouf's Hibbert Lecture that the Egyptian religion known to Greek and Latin writers was a late and corrupt stage of a much higher form which was monotheistic, and that the language expressive of this early belief survived side by side with the practice of polytheism. — 'The early History of Oxford' gives some insight into the intellectual condition of that university in distant times. Mr. Fletcher's 'Collectanea,' among other documents, contains the 'Day-Book of John Dorne, Bookseller' in 1520, by which we learn that very few books were required for the schools; the new Latin translation of Aristotle was supplanting the old thirteenth century versions, and the school grammars of Erasmus, Stanbridge, and Whittington, had eclipsed Priscian and Alexander de Villa Dei. The development of the university itself and its intellectual progress can now be followed pretty accurately by a study of the *Register*, edited by Mr. Boase, and the *Histories* of Mr. Parker, Mr. Maxwell Lyte, and Dr. Brodrick, the Warden of Merton College. — Among the shorter notices is one calling attention to the issue of the final volume of the English translation of Ewald's great work, *The History of Israel*, which is of great value as containing a copious index to the whole series. The translation is by Mr. J. F. Smith.

Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft, herausg. von IWAN MÜLLER. 14th series. 1886. no. 1-3.

Vol. xlv. pp. 1-80. 1. On the literature of the Attic orators during the years 1882-1885, by G. Hüttner. The reviewer notices 77 books, pamphlets or articles; 13 of a general nature, 12 on Antiphon, 14 on Lysias, 21 on Isocrates, 13 on Isaeus; specially commending Br. Keil's *Analecta Isocratea* and some grammatical pamphlets, C. Bohlmann and E. R. Schulze on attraction; S. Keck on the dual in the orators with reference to the Attic inscriptions; H. Gölkel on the syntax of the verb and construction of sentences in Antiphon. He is inclined, with Grosse, to suspect the *Trapeziticus* attributed to Isocrates. Amongst the editions reviewed are Hickie's Andocides *De Mysterioris*, Shuckburgh's Lysias, Herwerden's Antiphon, Kecks' Selections from Lysias (5 speeches) in the Bibliotheca Gothana; also a second edition of Froberg's Selections from Lysias by Gebauer, and the fifth edition of Isocrates' Panegyricus and Areopagiticus re-edited by Reinhardt. 2. On the Greek lyric and bucolic poets, excluding Pindar, by E. Hiller. A careful record of the emendations and suggestions proposed in pamphlets or articles of the years 1884 and 1885. Of the few dissertations not dealing directly with the text R. Holsten *De Stesichori et Ibyci dialecto et copia verborum* receives a long notice.

Vol. xlvii. pp. 1-48. Plautus from 1882-3 to 1885 by O. Seyffert. Under (1) a historical section, nineteen books or articles are noticed, many of great

value: as O. Ribbeck *Kolae*, A. Spengel on the headings and divisions of scenes in Latin comedy, E. Leidolph *De Festi et Pauli locis Plautinis*, E. A. Sonnenschein *Bentley's Plautine Emendations*, C. R. Opitz on Latin acrostics. (2) Prosody and metre is the subject of the next section, which deals with important papers by W. Meyer, Bücheler, and Leo; also with dissertations and articles of A. Luchs, P. Schrader, J. H. Onions, and E. Below. (3) Under the next, or grammatical and linguistic section, Abraham's *Studia Plautina* and L. Buchhold *De paromocoseos (alliterationis) usu* are the most important works treated: but the review will be continued in the next number.

Vol. xlviii. pp. 1-160.

1. Latin Lexicography from July 1, 1884 to June 30, 1886 by K. E. Georges. The reviewer notices the new *Archiv für Lexicographie*, a publication started by the Bavarian Academy in preparation for a future 'Thesaurus Latinae linguae'; Heerdegen, Stolz, and Schmalz in Iwan Müller's Handbuch, vol. ii.; and lexicons to Caesar by Merguet, Menge-Preuss and Meusel, all in course of publication, of which the last is by far the best. He denounces G. A. Saalfeld's *Tensaurus Italo-Græcus* as plagiarised from the reviewer's own Latin dictionary, filling five pages with borrowed Latin words which Saalfeld ought to have included, if he had devoted independent study to his task. The review is wonderfully thorough and minute; in all 45 publications are noticed, and in many of them the reviewer corrects misprints and wrong references. 2. Works dealing with Greek and Roman metre of the years 1883-1885 are reviewed at length by R. Klotz. In all 139 publications are classed under eight heads: the history of metrical theory (including Westphal's *Rhythmik* and translation of Aristoxenus), metre and prosody in general, the Greek epos, Greek lyric poetry, the Greek drama, the Saturnian verse, the Roman drama, and Roman lyric and epic poetry. Besides the comprehensive works of Gleditsch, L. Müller, Zambaldi, most attention is bestowed on W. Meyer's paper on the history of the hexameter, Tichelmann *De versibus Ionicis a minore*, M. Schmidt on the structure of Pindar's strophes, a number of papers by F. Hanssen (on the avoidance of the accent in the last syllable of a pentameter, &c.), N. Wecklein on the technique and delivery of the Aeschylean choral odes, the reviewer's own *Studia Aeschylea*, Gitlbauer's *Philologische Streifzüge*, H. Zieliński on the metrical arrangement of the parts in old Attic comedy, a series of papers on the Saturnian verse from O. Keller down to L. Müller *Der saturnische Vers und seine Denkmäler*, E. Trampe on the metre of Lucan, F. O. Stange on that of Martianus Capella. The papers of W. Meyer, Leo, Bücheler noticed by the reviewer of Plautus in vol. xlvii. are exhaustively analysed here, and a note at the end reviews an article by Blass and a book by Wilamowitz on Isyllus of Epidauros, the author of five poems inscribed in the temple of Asclepius, which were discovered and published by Kabbadias in 1885. One of these poems is a pæan in ionic metre, and the discovery naturally leads to renewed investigations as to the *versus ionicus* found in the lyric poets and the Attic drama.

Zeitschrift f. österr. Gymnasien xxxviii (1887) Heft

1. Wien, Gerold. *Kritisch-exegetischer Beitrag zu Porcius Licinius und Quintus Catulus*. Von F. Maixner.—*Ein Trojanerlied aus dem Mittelalter*. Von J. Huemer in Wien.—Reviews: 1. *Die homerischen Hymnen*. Hrsg. u. erl. von Dr A. Gemoll. 8vo. Leipzig, Teubner, 1886, pp. xiv 378. 6 M. 80 Pf. Rev. by E. Abel. Abel, himself the editor of the

Homeric hymns, epigrams and Batrachomyomachia in Schenkl's bibliotheca, points out many inaccuracies in the critical and exegetical notes, but ends with the testimony that Gemoll's commentary, 'eine sehr anerkennenswerte, durchaus selbständige Leistung ist, welche berufen ist, dem Studium der homerischen Hymnen neuen, kräftigen Impuls zu verleihen.' 2. *Herodotos*. von Dr J. Sitzler. vii Buch. 1 Abth. Text pp. vi 82. 2 Abth. Commentar. 8vo. Gotha, Perthes. 1885. 2 M. Rev. by J. Golling. Belongs to the 'Bibliotheca Gothana:' better suited to schools than the commentaries of Stein and Abicht.—3. *M. Tulli Ciceronis Cato maior*. Laelius. Scholarum in usum edidit Th. Schiche. Pragae, Tempsky. 1884. Rev. by A. Kornitzer. The author, known by his 'Jahresberichte' on Cicero's philosophical works (in the *Ztschr. f. d. Gw.*), founds his text mainly on that of C. F. W. Müller, but exercises everywhere an independent judgement.—4. Three reviews by A. Zingerle. A. *Prolegomena in T. Livii librum xxxiii*. Scr. Andr. Frigell. pp. 72. Gotha, Perthes. 1885. The author has published prolegomena and epilegomena to other books of Livy. They contain statements, brought up to date, respecting the readings of MSS. and editions, with independent comments and emendations. B. *Titi Livi ab urbe condita liber IV*. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von Franz Luterbacher. pp. 116. Leipzig, Teubner. 1886. Valuable both for text and commentary. C. *M. Valerii Martialis epigrammaton libri*. Recognovit Walth. Gilbert. pp. xxxiii; 408. Lipsiae in aedibus Teubneri. 1886. On spect. 15 8 Zingerle had made the correction *praemia cum laudum ferret, adhuc poterat*, before he knew that Ellis had published the same conjecture in 1885. Martial has *praemia ferre*, e.g. i 25 6. 31 3. vi 58 10. With iii 63 6 Zingerle compares Tibull. i 7 38 *movit et ad certos nescia membra modos*. 5. Priscillian. *Ein neu aufgefundener Schriftsteller des 4 Jahrhunderts*. Vortrag von Dr Georg Schepss. 26 pp. Würzburg. 1886. Rev. by J. Huemer. The author, beheaded as a heretic in 385, will now be known to us by eleven treatises, more or less complete, which fill 145 leaves of a MS. assigned by the best judges to the 5th or 6th cent. The biblical citations are prehieronymian and correspond closely to those in Aug. spec. Schepss has undertaken to edit the book for the Vienna library of Latin fathers. The divinity of the heretics, Leusibora, named by Jerome, has been discovered by Schepss in Job 38 39 *θηπέσεις δὲ λέονσι βοράν*, turned into *tu capies Leosiboram* Under 'Miscellen' J. M. Stowasser commends (1) *Platon's Protagoras*, v. Dr. J. Deuschle. 4 Aufl. bearb. v. Dr. Ch. W. J. Cron. pp. 140. Leipzig, Teubner, 1884; (2) *Taciti Germania*, Erl. v. Dr. H. Schweizer-Sidler. 4 Aufl. pp. xvi 95. Halle, Waisenhaus. 1884. (3) *Platon's ausgewählte Dialoge*. Erkl. v. C. Schmelzer. Berlin, Weidmann. 1883-4, vol vi pp. 111. (Meno, Euthyphro); vii pts. 1 and 2 pp. 203, 260 (republic).

Hermes, vol. xxii. part 1, contains: 1. *Die Obeliskenschrift von Philae*, by U. Wilcken, in which Letronne's explanation (*Récit. des Inscr. Gr. and Lat. de l'Égypte*, i. p. 333, &c.) is corrected through the light afforded by the cursive Greek papyri. The answer to the priests' petition (A) is shown to be written by the king, not by his *ἐπιστολογράφος*, whose position therefore as a responsible minister is not proved, and Wilcken's conjecture that the priests of Isis were also priests of the Ptolemies here, as at Alexandria, Ptolemais and Thebes, is confirmed by the hieroglyphics on the obelisk. 2. *Der Capitolinische Juppitertempel und der Italische Ficus*, by O. Richter; already discussed in vol. xviii.

Richter gives up his theory that Dionys. (iv. 61) states the dimensions of the temple in the old 'Italian feet' of '278m, and not the Graeco-Roman feet of '296m, but cites various measurements from the walls of Italian towns as well as Rome to prove that the Italian foot was in use in them. 3. *Die Ueberlieferung über die Römischen Penaten*, by G. Wissowa, who correcting tradition by archaeology shows that the P. were old Italian deities, identified perhaps in the fifth century with the Dioscuri (see Dionys. i. 68, and the denarii of M. Fonteius and C. Sulpicius). Then Cassius Hemina confused them with the Samothracian Kabiri, while Varro gives them a Trojan origin, and looks for their proper representation in the 'sigilla lignea' of Lavinium, rather than in the Dioscuri figures in the temple of the P. at Rome. Kept then in the Vesta temple (*Tac. Ann.* xv. 41) they gave rise to all sorts of speculations as to their nature and number. 4. *Zur Kritik des Redners Lysurg*, by L. Cohn, deals with comparative value of two MSS., the Crippsianus (A) and the Oxoniensis (N). In opposition to Rehdantz and Thalheim, Cohn prefers the latter, as less vitiated by grammarians' corrections or interpolations. 5. A letter of W. Dörpfeld to Mommsen denying the identity of the Roman and Italian feet. 6. *Zu den Griechischen Sacralalterthümern*, by P. Stengel: a criticism on passages from Hipponax (cited in Tzetzes), Aristoph. (Eq. 1140) and Lysias And. vi. 53, and the Scholia on them, supposed to prove human sacrifices at the Thargelia. The sacrifices really took place, but only on occasions of pestilence, &c.; Harpokration, who alone mentions the Thargelia, confuses these occasions with the annual sacrifice to Demeter at that festival. 7. *Die Römischen Tribuseintheilung nach dem marsischen Krieg*, by Th. Mommsen, who proves, in opposition to Beloch, (1) that the faithful as well as the unfaithful Italian cities were confined to eight tribes by the law of 664, but (2) that this arrangement was temporary, and that both classes of cities were afterwards distributed among all the country tribes. The last point he proves by inscriptions. 8. *Demotika der Attischen Metochen* by U. von W. Mollendorff: inferences as to distribution of μέτοικοι among the demes from Attic inscriptions dating 430 to 330 B.C.; to be continued.

Among the *Miscellen* we can only mention C. Robert: eine Attische Künstlerinschrift, discovered last year on the abacus of a Doric capital near the Propylaea: Robert restores thus:

Νέαρχος ἀνέθηκεν ὁ κεραμε
 υς ἔργον ἀπαρχήν τ(ῆ) Αθηναία
 Ἀντήνωρ ἐποίησεν
 ὁ Εὐμαρο(υ)ς τὸ ἀγαλμα.

and U. Wilcken, 'Die memphitischen Papyri der Königl. Bibliothek zu Berlin, u. der Kais. Bibl. zu Petersburg.'

Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie u. Pädagogik. Fleckeisen u. Masius. 1887. Heft 1 contains (1) *Nautisches zu Homeros*, by A. Breusing, notes on the longer stretches of Odysseus' voyage. (2) Emend. to *Hymn. Herm.* 234, αἰὲν ἀπειλῶν for αὐτὸς Ἀπόλλων, by A. Ludwig. (3) *Zum Homerischen Margites*, by E. Hiller, showing that the lines ἄλλ' οἷς κ.τ.λ. quoted by Marius Victorinus II. c. 74, s. 79, and elsewhere, are probably the beginning of a spurious introduction to *Margites*: that the iambic trimeters of the poem were probably original, and that Pigres was not the author. (4) Emendations to Eur. *Meleas*, by F. Giesing, v. 217 τοὺς δ' οὐ θυραλοὺς αἶ γ' ἀφ' ἡσυχίου ποδός, v. 338 ἀμβροσίους τε πινός, v. 42 μὴ τὴν τύραννον, vv. 40 and 41 being omitted. (5) *Der Beschluss der Phratric Δημοσιωρίζαι*, CIA. II.

2 n. 841^b, by G. Gilbert, a detailed explanation of the decree. (6) Emendations to Xen. *Hellenica* (19 passages) by A. Otto. (7) *Zur Chronologie u. Geschichte der Perserkriege*, by G. Busolt, a paper founded on the lately-discovered fact that there was a partial solar eclipse visible from the Isthmus on Oct. 2nd, 480 B.C. (cf. Herod. IX. 10). From this date the author reckons backwards and fixes other dates, e.g. battle of Salamis on Sept. 27th or 28th. (8) *Der Faden der Ariadne*, by O. Keller, suggesting that the Labyrinth was really a mine in which, as in a certain Egyptian emerald-mine, described by an Arabic writer Makrisi († 1442), a clue of rope was fastened for the guidance of the miners. (9) *Dionysios Periegetes*, by G. F. Unger, confirming the hypothesis that this writer lived about A.D. 90. (10) *Zu Aristoteles Poetik*, by F. Susemihl, two conjectural additions, 18, 1455^b 32 ff. τὸ δὲ τέταρτον <ἢ ἀπλῆ, οἶον * * παρέκβασις δ' ἢ τερατώδης, οἶον αἶ τε Φορκίδες κ.τ.λ. and 24, 1459^b 8 ff. ἀναγνωρίσεων καὶ παθημάτων <καὶ ἡθῶν>. (11) Note by A. Ludwig that ἡμιμήης-τμήτος is right (not -τμήξ, -τμήγος) in the passages cited. (12) *Carmen*, by E. Bachrens, deriving this word from root *car* 'cut,' which appears in *cārere*, *carina*, *carnem*, *cardo* ('scheidelinie'), so that *carmen* is speech 'rhythmically divided,' cf. Cic. *de Or.* III. 48, 186. (13) *Zu Caesars Bellum Civile*, three emendations to Book I., by H. Gilbert. (14) *Zu Ciceros Büchern de Oratore*, by W. Friedrich, a description of several MSS. lately collated and a list of new readings. (15) *Zu Arnobius*, by F. Polle, suggesting in *adv. Nat.* IV. 21 *supercilii nutu* and similarly *pallida leto* in the fragment of Ennius quoted by Cic. *Tusc.* I. § 48. (16) A note by 'H. P.' showing that Robert Schumann, the musician, was employed as one of the revisers and correctors for the Schneeberg edition of Forcellini.

The paedagogic portion of the same *Jahrbuch* contains, among other things, the first part of the report of a meeting of schoolmasters (in Hanover, Oct. 5th and 6th, 1886) for the purpose of abolishing the distinction between Gymnasien and Realschulen and establishing, instead, 'Einheitsschulen,' in which modern subjects are to be taught at the expense of Latin, and Germany, now politically united, is to be mentally and spiritually 'unified' under the influence of Greek. About 100 schoolmasters attended the conference.

Leipziger Studien ix. 1 consists of a 'historia critica' in Latin of Greek and Roman 'consolationes,' by Carolus Buresch, 1-172. The most ancient consolatio we possess, the Axiochus by the Socratic Aeschines, is defective in places (p. 13), and may enshrine some poetical fragments (p. 18 sq.). Crantor and Epicurus both used the Axiochus: Luer. 3, 830-1094 comes from Epicurus (p. 60 sq.). The consolatio of Plutarch, borrowed like that of Cicero from Crantor, is genuine (p. 65). The ἀπαράσημα of Antiphon in Stobaeus are from the τέχνη ἀλυσίας of the sophist. The tetralogies also are probably not by the orator but by the sophist. Seneca's *consolatio ad Marcianum*: date discussed (p. 108): the *ad Polybium* is a forgery. There are several excursus, among which on p. 135 are emendations of Boethius' poems, p. 138 comparison of *con* and *σύν* in composition (the *con* in *condoleo*, *conqueror* = *penitus*) p. 140 on *apologus* = *fabula*. The number ends with an epimetrum on Philodemus *περὶ θανάτου*, promising in a short time an edition and commentary thereof: p. 162 a list of new words in Philodemus. Among passages discussed or emended are Statius' *epicedion in patrem*, 54 (p. 5) epitaph of Callimachus (p. 44), Axiochus 370a (p. 102), Stobaeus p. 47, 21 (p. 82). Notice also a note on optative with *πῶς* to express wish in late Greek (p. 128).

Leipziger Studien ix. 2 (pp. 173–262) *De fastis consularibus antiquissimis* (C. Cichorius). The history of the Fasti is here traced by means of the cognomina which they exhibit. 'Cognomina were absent from the oldest Fasti; at a later date they were added (conjecturally, as it would seem) by two writers in two different ways. Hence we have two "recensiones"; one, due to Licinius Macer, is preserved in Idatius, the Chronicon Paschale and certain parts of Livy and Dionysius; the other, connected with the name of Castor, reappears in Diodorus. These two recensions were united together by a writer of the Ciceronian age, probably Atticus, and this third version, containing the cognomina of both the earlier ones, is the source of the Fasti Capitolini.' The paper is clever and acute; but there is a very weak attack (p. 175) on Jordan's view that 'Vetusius &c.' are due to Sullan grammarians. (pp. 263–336) *de rebus Tegeaticis* (G. Schwedler). An account of the history and constitution of the Arcadian Tegea in four chapters, the *pagi*, the tribes, the monarchy and the republic. (pp. 337–342) *Apinae tricaeque* (O. Ribbeck) '*Apinae* belongs to the Greek εἰς Ἀφάνας, *tricae* is plural from *trica*, accus. of θρίξ. "Afannae" (= *apinae*) should be read in Apul. Met. ix. 10 and x. 10 (cp. Wölfflin's Archiv 2, 341, 597). The whole expression comes probably from a Greek comedy.' Ribbeck does not notice Nettleship's conjecture *aginae* (*Journal of Phil.* xi. 100).

Bezenberger's Beiträge zur Kunde der Indogermanischen Sprachen. Vol. xii. part 3 (1887).

PROFESSOR BLASS collects the dialectic inscriptions of Corinth, Sicyon, Phlius, etc. Kaulin writes on a Lettish dialect of Livonia. Collitz, dating from Philadelphia, defends against Osthoff his claim to the discovery of the 'palatal-law': a polemic which we might have been spared. The editor supplies some interesting etymologies, e.g. Lat. *arbiter* Umbr. *ad-putrati*, Old Norse *at-kvaði* (Eng. *quoth*), κρόσσα Eng. *roof*, σάλνω Lith. *twainytis*, ταχύς Lith. *danginti* Sk. *dagh*. Bury well connects Lat. *ul-s* and Eng. *out*: less satisfactorily he makes *simul* = ἄμυνδ-ις (what of ἀμυοβη-δῖς?), and attempts to confine Lat. *l* for *d* to cases in which a *u*-sound precedes or follows.

Theologische Literaturzeitung, herausg. von AD. HARNACK und F. SCHÜRER. The following articles may be noticed. 29 Jan.—Holzmann, *Lehrbuch der Historisch-kritischen Einleitung in das N.T.* 2^{te} aufl. (Schürer). The best book for information as to the present state of the various questions about N.T. Introduction. The improvements introduced in the second edition are that it gives (1) the *exegetic* literature for the several books; (2) a new section on the Apocrypha of the N.T.; (3) an index.—Vischer. *Die Offenbarung Johannis eine Jüdische Apokalypse in Christlicher Bearbeitung. Mit einem Nachwort von Ad. Harnack* (Texte und Untersuchungen, Bd. II. Heft 3). Overbeck). Some thirty years ago Lücke said that the ground from which the Revelation of St. John sprang would be found in Jewish Apocalyptic literature. Vischer's book is an attempt to work out this conception critically, pointing out what portions must be referred to the original Jewish Apokalypse, and what are Christian additions. Overbeck thinks that Vischer's hypothesis may claim a high degree of probability, though he doubts whether his general result is so 'vollständig positiv' as the author supposes.—Weyland, *Compilatie en Omwerkingshypothese toegepast op de Apokalypse van Johannes* (Overbeck). Another work on the same hypothesis as Vischer's, and agreeing to a considerable extent in

results.—Zur '*Lehre der Zwölf Apostel*.' 3^{te} Artikel. A continuation of the series of articles in which Harnack is giving an account of the principal books relating to the 'Teaching of the Twelve Apostles.' In this number he directs attention to the services of the American scholars Harris, Orris, and Warfield in directing attention to the fact that Athanasius made use of the Didache in the Σύνταγμα Διδασκαλίας.—Krüger, *Lucifer von Calaris* (Möller). Important monograph for the history of Lucifer's time. In appendices, it discusses (among other things) the Canon of Scripture which Lucifer used, and controverts Caspari's hypothesis that Lucifer was the author of the baptismal exhortation in his *Quellen zur Gesch. des Taufsymbols*, II. 128–182. 12 Feb.—Thoma, *Ein Ritt ins Gelobte Land* (Socin). An attempt to describe the condition of Palestine in the time of Solomon. Archaeology good.—Weizsäcker, *Das Apostolische Zeitalter der Christlichen Kirche* (Looss). Important article. Looss compares throughout Weizsäcker's statements with those which he has made at various times on the same subject in the *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*, and concludes that he has retrograded towards the old Tübingen school. In particular, he is much too sceptical as to the historical character of the Acts. Harnack, in his article on the 'Teaching' (col. 33) thinks that Weizsäcker's book can scarcely be surpassed. 26 Feb.—Finsler, *Wellhausen's Ansicht* (Baethgen). A small book, but hits some blots in Wellhausen's theory with great dexterity.—Abercius von Hieropolis, nicht Hierapolis (Krüger). A notice (taken, with acknowledgement from Lightfoot's *Ignatius* I. 467 ff.) of the interesting discoveries of Mr. W. M. Ramsay (see *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, July 1882, and *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1882, p. 339, and 1883, p. 424) which prove that Abercius belonged to Hieropolis, and have made it possible to restore his epitaph. 12 Mar.—Stanton, *The Jewish and Christian Messiah* (Schürer). The book is a very pleasant phenomenon, and the author's method, that of comparing Christian ideas with Jewish, unquestionably the right one. Moreover, he is well qualified for his work by his freedom from prejudice, and his knowledge of the subject; but Schürer thinks that he has not paid sufficient attention to the mediatorial aspect of the Messiah.—Bigg, *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria* (A. Harnack). A highly laudatory notice. The work is based on an admirable knowledge of the works of the Alexandrines, and shows both great insight and intellect, and excellent style. Clement's views have probably never before been so well and clearly stated. Bigg follows Harnack in taking Tertullian's 'Persona' juristically; Harnack thinks he ought to have so taken 'substantia' also. Harnack objects to Bigg's statement that, the interest, the meaning, of Gnosticism rest entirely upon its ethical motive.

Revue numismatique. Paris. 1887. Part I.

'Lycian Coins,' by J. P. Six. The concluding part of Mr. Six's elaborate study of Lycian numismatics begun in the *Revue* for 1886. An Index of Types, Symbols and Proper Names is appended.—'The date of the accession of Constantine the Great according to Eusebius and the coins,' by the Comte de Westphalen. The writer endeavours, from numismatic evidence, to explain the origin of two apparently contradictory statements in Eusebius (*Vita Const.* I. 5; iv. 53) as to the duration of Constantine's reign.—Reviews: Wroth's 'Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Crete and the Aegean Islands,' by E. Babelon.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS PUBLISHED FROM FEBRUARY 15 TO MARCH 15, 1887.

BOOKS PUBLISHED IN ENGLAND.

- Caesar.* Gaii Julii Caesaris de bello Gallico Commentariorum V. Edited with Notes and Vocabulary for use of schools by C. Colbeck, M.A. 16mo. vi. 128 pp. Map. London, Macmillan. 1s. 6d.
- Livy.* Books V., VI. and VII. With Introduction and Notes by A. R. Cluer, B.A., Balliol College. Second edition revised by P. E. Matheson, M.A., New College. 12mo. 228, 147 pp. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 5s.
- Mohaffy* (J. P.) Rambles and Studies in Greece. Third edition, revised and enlarged. Crown 8vo. xviii. 465 pp. Map and Illustrations. London. Macmillan. 10s. 6d.
- Ovid.* P. Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphoseon XIII., XIV. Edited with Introduction, Analysis and Notes by Charles Simmons, M.A. 12mo. viii. 256 pp. London. Macmillan. 4s. 6d.
- Plato.* Talks with Socrates about Life. Translations from the Gorgias and the Republic. 12mo. xxii. 176 pp. London. Fisher Unwin. 3s. 6d.
- Reed* (S. Percy). The Candidates' Latin Grammar. Cr. 8vo. iv. 159 pp. London. Ward & Downey. 3s. 6d.
- Tacitus.* The Histories of Tacitus. Books I. and II. With Introduction and Notes by A. D. Godley, M.A. 12mo. xiv. 262 pp. London. Macmillan. 5s.
- Xenophon.* The Cyropaedia. Books I. and II. With Introduction and Notes by the Rev. H. Holden. Edited for the Syndics of the University Press. 2 vols. 12mo. lxxviii. 355 pp. 1 map. 6s.

BOOKS PUBLISHED ON THE CONTINENT.

- Aristoteles.* Traité de la génération des animaux d'Aristote traduit en Français pour la première fois et accompagné de notes perpétuelles par J. Barthélemy-Saint-Hilaire. 2 vols. 8vo. cclxxiv. 124, 551 pp. Paris. Hachette. 20 fr.
- Bauer* (A.) Thukydides und H. Müller-Strübing. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der philologischen Methode. 8vo. 31 pp. Nördlingen. Beck. 70 pf.
- Bojačić* (Jr. von). Denkmäler des Mithras Kultus in Kroatien. 8vo. 16 pp. 2 pl. Agram. Hartmann. 60 pf.
- Briel* (A.) De Callistrato et Philonide sive de actionibus Aristophaneis. 8vo. 68 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. 1 Mk. 60.
- Carmina figurata graeca.* Ad fidem potissimum codicis Palatini edidit, prolegomenis instruxit, app. crit., scholia adj. C. Haebelin. Ed. II. correctior. 8vo. Hannover. Hahn. 3 Mk.
- Casati* (C. C.) La gens; origine étrusque de la gens romaine (*extr.* Mémoires de l'Académie étrusque). 8vo. 18 pp. Paris. Didot.
- Causseret* (Chr.) Étude sur la langue de la rhétorique et de la critique littéraire dans Cicéron. 8vo. 247 pp. Paris. Hachette. 4 fr.
- Cicero.* Orationes pro A. Licinio Archia poeta, pro Q. Ligario, pro M. Marcello, scholarum in usum ad opt. ed. fidem rec. C. Fumagalli. 16mo. 36 pp. Verona. Drucker et Tedeschi. 30c.
- Pro Q. Ligario oratio, con note italiane di C. Fumagalli. 16mo. 26 pp. Verona. Drucker et Tedeschi. 50c.
- Cons* (L.) Notions sommaires d'histoire de l'antiquité, avec portraits historiques, gravures et cartes. 12mo. 358 pp. Paris. Delagrave. 50c.
- Crozals* (J. de) Histoire de la civilisation. Tome 1er., Depuis les temps antiques jusqu'à Charlemagne. 12mo. 691 pp. Paris. Delagrave. 4 fr. 50c.
- Darmesteter* (A.) La vie des mots étudiée dans leurs significations. 12mo. xii. 212 pp. Paris. Delagrave. 2 fr.
- Engel* (E.) Die Aussprache des Griechischen. Ein Schnitt in einen Schulzopf. 8vo. VII. 168 pp. Jena. Costenoble. 2 Mk. 50.
- Fecht* (K.) Griechisches Übungsbuch für Untertertia. 2. gänzlich umgearbeitete Aufl. 8vo. iv. 165 pp. Freiburg. Herder. 1 Mk. 25.
- Függer* (F.) Cäsarsätze zur Einübung der latein. Syntax. 2 verm. Aufl. 8vo. III. 58 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. 1 Mk.
- Gebhard* (F.) Übungsbuch zum Übersetzen aus dem Deutschen ins Lateinische. 2. verbesserte und verm. Auflage. 8vo. viii. 162 pp. Amberg. Pohl. 1 Mk. 60.
- Girard* (J.) Le sentiment religieux en Grèce d'Homère à Eschyle, étudié dans son développement moral et dans son caractère dramatique. Troisième édition. 12mo. 452 pp. Paris. Hachette. 3 fr. 50.
- Goetz* (G.) Nova meletemata Festina. 4to. 8 pp. Jena. 50 pf.
- Hartel* (W. von) Bibliotheca patrum latinorum hispanensis. Band I. Nach den Aufzeichnungen G. Loewe's bearbeitet. (*extr.* Sitzungsberichte d. Wiener Akad.) 8vo. iii. 542 pp. Vienna. Gerold. 8 Mk.
- Jordan* (H.) Comm. fragm. de Sallustii hist. libri II. reliquiis quae ad bellum piraticum Servilianum pertinent. 4to. 8 pp. Königsberg. 20 pf.
- Jousserandot* (L.) Des assesseurs près des tribunaux romains (*extr.* Compte rendu de l'Académie des sciences morales et politiques). 8vo. 21 pp. Paris. Larose et Forel.
- Kirchhoff* (A.) Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Alphabets. 4. umgearb. Aufl. VI. 180 pp. 1 map, 2 plates. Gütersloh. Bertelsmann. 6 Mk.
- Kramer* (O.) De Pelopis fabula. Pars I. 8vo. 42 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk.
- Lucrèce.* De la nature des choses. Livre cinquième. Avec traduction française en regard, introduction, analyse et notes par E. Talbot. 12mo. lxxii. 116 pp. Paris. Delalain. 1 fr. 80c.
- Meyer* (E. H.) Homer und die Ilias. 8vo. VII. 258 pp. Berlin. Oppenheim. 4 Mk. 50.
- Richardson* (G. M.) De 'dum' particula apud prisca scriptores latinos usu. 8vo. 95 pp. Leipzig. 2 Mk.
- Simon* (J.) Zur zweiten Hälfte der Inschrift von Gortyn. (*extr.* Wiener Studien). 8vo. 24 pp. Vienna. Gerold. 80 pf.
- Sophokles* erklärt von J. Holub. I. Oidipus Tyrannos. 8vo. xii. 92 pp. 1 plate. Paderborn. F. Schöningh. 1 Mk. 50.
- Spangenbergii* (Joh.) bellum grammaticale, iterum edidit R. Schneider. 8vo. x. 41 pp. Göttingen. Vandenhoeck. 1 Mk.
- Testamentum Vetus, Graece, juxta LXX interpretes. Ed. C. de Tischendorf. Ed. VII. rec. supplementum auxit E. Nestle. 2 vols. 8vo. 81, 684, 616, 10, 203 pp. Leipzig. Brockhaus. 15 Mk.
- Nestle's Supplement, separately, 5 Mk.
- Valentin.* Horatii carmen II. 7 neu erklärt. 8vo. 16 pp. Frankfurt. Rütten und Loening. 50 pf.
- Vergil.* L'Eneide, testo, costruzione, versione letterale, versione libera, sommari e note. Libro I. 16mo. 107 pp. Verona. Drucker et Tedeschi. 1 f. 50c.
- Willens* (P.) Les élections municipales à Pompéi. 8vo. 143 pp. Paris. Thorin. 2 fr. 50.
- Windisch* (E.) Georg Curtius. Eine Charakteristik. 8vo. 56 pp. Berlin. Calvary. 2 Mk. 40.
- Xenophon.* Extraits des Mémoires expliqués et traduits par M. Sommer. 12mo. 231 pp. Paris. Hachette. 2 fr. 50.

UNIVERSITY INTELLIGENCE.

(Continued from page 77.)

OXFORD.

EXAMINATIONS.

FORTHCOMING SCHOLARSHIP EXAMINATIONS.

(In all the following Examinations, unless otherwise stated, Candidates must be under 19 years of age).

New College: Examination begins Tuesday, May 3, Exhibition for Chemistry or Biology (with elementary Mechanics, Physics and Classics), value £50. No limit of age. Candidates to call at New College day before with testimonials.

(*Abbott Scholarship*: Tuesday, May 3, for Classics, value about £60 for three years. Candidates must be sons of clergymen and need assistance. It is not tenable with another Scholarship or Exhibition above £50 in value. For further particulars apply to Principal of St. Mary Hall.)

Merton College: Wednesday, June 8, Exhibition in Modern History, value £60. No limit of age. For details see *University Gazette*, February 1.—June 28, Postmastership for Chemistry and Physics (with optional Biology), value £80. Candidates to call on the Warden on the day before the Examination in either case.

Corpus: Wednesday, June 28, along with Merton, one Natural Science Scholarship, value £80. Same conditions as Merton; candidates to call on the Warden of Merton.

University, Exeter, Oriel, Brasenose, Christ Church Combined Examination: Tuesday, June 28, at Christ Church. Names and papers to be sent to Provost of Oriel, on or before June 20, stating if the candidates wish to board in one of the colleges, and candidates have also to call at Exeter College on June 27 between 8–10 p.m. The Scholarships and Exhibitions to be awarded are as follows:—*Brasenose*: Three Classical Scholarships, value £80, and three Hulme Exhibitions, two for Classics and one for Modern History, value £80. Candidates for the Hulmes must be under 20 years of age on July 7, 1887, and must need assistance, and should call on the Principal before June 1. For details of Modern History Exhibitions see *University Gazette*, February 1. Also four classical Somerset Scholarships, limited in the first instance to Manchester, Marlborough, and Hereford Schools, but may be thrown open in default of properly qualified candidates. *Christ Church*: Two Classical Scholarships, value £80. Two Exhibitions, value about £85. *Exeter*: Two Classical Scholarships, value £80. One Carter Scholarship for Classics, value £80, no limit of age, *ceteris paribus* preference given to candidates

born in Kent. One Hasker Scholarship, value £80, mainly Divinity, partly Classical, no limit of age. One Classical Exhibition, value £80. For Stapledon How, and other Scholarships or Exhibitions, see *University Gazette*, February 1. *Oriel*: Three Classical Scholarships, value £80. One Bible-Clerkship, candidates for which must show that they need assistance, value about £110. *University*: Four Classical Scholarships, value £80.

New College: Wednesday, October 12, History Exhibition, value £50. No limit of age.

RESULTS OF EXAMINATIONS: University Prizes—*Arnold Essay*, H. W. Blunt, Oriel (King's College School). *Boden Sanskrit Scholar*, N. S. Brodie, Christ Church (University College School). *Vinerian Law Scholar*, R. A. Shephard, Trinity (Sedbergh): Accessit, J. C. Ledlie, Lincoln (Belfast). Denyer and Johnson Theological Scholars—1. L. J. M. Bebb, Brasenose (Winchester); 2. E. T. Green, St. John's (Westminster).

COLLEGE SCHOLARSHIPS: *University*, Mth. Sch. J. M. Chambers (Wolverhampton), E. Smith (Clifton). *Balliol*, Mth. Exh. H. J. R. Murray (Mill Hill); Sc. Sch. W. Pullinger (Manchester); Hist. Sch. C. J. S. Howard (Rugby), G. A. Wood (Owens); Hist. Exh. A. Hepburn (Leamington). *Merton*, Mth. Postm. J. H. Marston (Wolverhampton). *Exeter*, Mth. Sch. J. Forbes (Carlisle). *Queens*, Cl. Sch. C. E. M. Hawkesworth (Clifton), C. J. N. Fleming (Fettes), W. A. Appleyard (Birmingham), V. G. Crawley (St. Paul's), E. A. C. Stowell (Sedbergh), J. B. Firth (Bradford), F. E. Webb (Oxford High School), W. P. Bond (Merchant Taylors); Sc. Sch. W. B. Crump (Bradford); Mth. and Sc. Exh. W. C. Dobie (Bradford); Cl. Exh. J. H. G. Wilson (York); Mth. Exh. W. E. K. Hare (Heversham), S. Baker (Manchester), A. E. Dyer (Southwark), J. Finniswood (St. Bees), W. H. Finney (Owens), G. Smallpiece (St. Bees); Bible Clerk, A. D. Miller (Glasgow College). *New College*, Mth. Sch. E. W. Lovegrove (Crosby). *Magdalen*, Mth. Demy, W. J. Wood (Portsmouth), Mth. Exh. A. J. Chambers (Manchester); Sc. Dem. J. F. Childs (Portsmouth), J. S. Fairbairn (Bradford). *Brasenose*, Mth. Sch. J. H. Denbigh (Bath College). *Christ Church*, Mth. Exh. T. P. Kent (Kingswood); Sc. Exh. J. W. Macpherson (Dublin School of Science); Hist. Sch. E. Owen (Lampeter). *Trinity*, Sc. Exh. H. C. Dowdall (Rugby). *St. John's*, Cuthbert Sch. A. S. Peake (Coventry). *Wadham*, Mth. Sch. S. A. F. White (Portsmouth). *Hertford*, Mth. Exh. H. Y. Plum (Worcester Free School).

CAMBRIDGE.

1. FORTHCOMING SCHOLARSHIP EXAMINATIONS.

(Candidates for the following must be under 19 years of age).

Downing: Exam. begins June 1. Two Minor Scholarships, value £50. Subjects: Law and Natural Science.

Selwyn: June 15. One Classical and one Mathematical Scholarship, value £30.

Caius: October 1. One Scholarship in Oriental languages, one in Mediaeval and Modern languages, value £50.

2. RESULTS OF EXAMINATIONS.

Poiris Medal: N. K. Stephen, Trinity (Fettes). *Porson Prize*: W. G. Headlam, King's (Harrow); honourably mentioned N. K. Stephen, and J. J. Withers, King's (Eton). *Browne Medals*: for Greek Hexameters, Latin Ode, and Latin Epigram, W. G. Headlam; for Greek Epigram, F. W. Thomas, Trinity (Birmingham). *Burney Prize*: W. G. Manley, Pembroke (Rugby). *Fellowships*: A. Nairne has been elected to a fellowship at *Jesus*: M. R. James (Eton) and G. L. Dickinson (Charterhouse) at *King's*: A. E. Shipley (private tuition) at *Christ's*: and S. J. Hickson at *Downing*.

COLLEGE SCHOLARSHIPS: *Trinity*: THIRD YEAR—*Sc.* R. H. Adie (Intern. Coll. London), *Cl.* J. H. Badley (Rugby), *Cl.* W. C. Bridgeman (Eton), *Mth.* W. Dunn (Blackheath), *Mth.* W. D. Eggar (Brighton), *Cl.* S. W. Meek (Harrow). SECOND YEAR—*Mth.* J. J. Guest (Marlborough), *Mth.* V. T. Kirby (Heversham), *Cl.* F. J. L. Ogilvy (Fettes), *Cl.* B. Pares (Harrow), *Mth.* H. Savery (Chr. Hosp.). FIRST YEAR—*Mth.* F. W. Dyson (Bradford), *Mth.* G. F. Emery (Ely), *Mth.* P. C. Gaul (Birmingham), *Cl.* J. P. Gilson (Haileybury), *Mth. and Sc.* J. S. Mackenzie (Glasgow), *Cl.* O. Thompson (Univ. Coll. Sch.), *Cl.* G. A. Turner (Oakham), *Mth.* G. T. Walker (St. Paul's). OPEN—*Cl.* A. B. Cook (St. Paul's), G. A. Davies (Owens), *Mth.* T. A. E. Sanderson (City of London). MINOR SCHOLARS—*Cl.* W. J. Boycott (Hereford), C. L. Davies (Marlborough), *Mth.* A. Vaughan (Univ. Coll. Sch.), H. Cayley (Sherborne), *Cl.* A. E. Chilver (Haileybury), *Mth.* H. N. Sheppard (Charterhouse), A. E. Stamp (St. Paul's). EXHIBITIONERS—*Mth.* A. E. Broomfield (St. Paul's), J. F. Iselin (Charterhouse), A. P. Marwood (Clifton), *Cl.* R. A. Nicholson (Aberdeen), A. E. Pope (St. Paul's).

St. John's: SCHOLARS—*Mth.* J. H. Reeves (Surrey County Sch.), *Cl.* T. Hicklin (Shrewsbury), *Sc.* J. T. Hewitt (S. Kensington Coll. of Science), *Mth.* O. W.

Owen (Liverpool Institute). MINOR SCHOLARS—*Mth.* G. T. Bennett (Univ. Coll. Sch.), *Cl.* L. B. Radford (Mansfield), R. A. Lehfeldt (priv. tuition). EXHIBITIONERS—*Mth.* J. J. Alexander (Belfast), *Sc.* F. F. Blackman (St. Barth. Hospital), *Cl.* B. Constantine (Bradford), *Hebrew*, T. Heal (priv. tuition), *Sc.* H. E. Schmitz (Owens), *Cl.* St. J. B. Wynne-Willson (Cheltenham). *King's*: *Cl.* Scholars—T. B. Lewis (Eton), H. St. J. Thackeray (Eton), H. M. Beck (Eton), J. A. C. Tilley (Eton), A. G. Bather (Rossall), E. H. Miles (Marlborough). Exhibitioners—*Mth.* A. J. Mayne (priv. tuition), H. Aris (Rossall), *Sc.* E. R. Delbruck (Clifton). *Peterhouse*: *Mth.* L. T. Giles (Chr. Hosp.), *Sc.* A. G. Penny (Clifton), *Cl.* G. E. R. Brown (St. Paul's). *Pembroke*: *Cl.* Scholars, W. C. Geldart (Tonbridge), A. Jagger (Shrewsbury), W. K. Robertson (Oundle), B. Thompson (Rossall), *Mth.* Schol. P. W. Everett (Ipswich), H. A. Thomson (Aldenharn), F. M. Marzials (St. Paul's). *Caius*: *Mth.* Sch. G. D. Tripp (St. Paul's), C. E. Cullis (Birmingham), *Cl.* Sch. T. A. Bertram (City of London), A. O. W. C. Staats (Dulwich), O. W. Whaley (York), *Cl.* Exh. J. Y. Lyle (St. Paul's), C. B. Wedd (Boston), *Sc.* Sch. J. B. Wood (Newcastle, Staff.), *Mth.* Exh. E. A. Peters (Charterhouse), F. C. Bothamley (Giggleswick). *Corpus*: *Mth.* Sch. T. W. Edmondson (Skipton), H. C. Roe (Chr. Hosp.), W. R. Hitchins (Macclesfield), *Cl.* Sch. W. F. Baldock (Ipswich), A. S. Lamprey (Southwark). *Queens'*: *Mth.* Sch. P. Harrison (St. Paul's), R. N. Haygarth (Isle of Man), Lewis (Lampeter), S. A. Bennett (Newcastle, Staff.), White (Bristol), *Cl.* Sch. L. M. Dinwoody (Isle of Man). *Jesus*: *Cl.* Sch. H. O. B. Nicholson (Leamington), G. F. Clark (St. Paul's), W. R. Rendall (Newton Abbot), B. A. Snell (Haileybury), A. P. Annand (Shrewsbury), G. M. Gwyther (Bradford), *Mth.* Sch. O. Y. Maller (Newton Abbot), S. W. Burgess (Rossall), J. P. H. Soper (Chigwell). *Christ's*: *Cl.* A. T. Rackham (City of London), *Mth.* A. C. Dutt (Wren and Gurney), G. Middlemass (Durham); *Cl.* W. R. Elliston (Ipswich), *Cl.* and *Mth.* A. T. Pitt (Derby); *Sc.* H. L. C. de Candole (St. Paul's), *Mth.* R. N. Haygarth (Isle of Man), *Cl.* F. B. Baker (Cheltenham). *Emmanuel*: *Mth.* Sch. A. W. H. Compton (Monkton Combe), T. Hyett (Cheltenham Gr. Sch.), *Mth.* Exh. A. E. Daniels (Leicester), J. C. Denmead (Exeter), *Cl.* Exh. E. C. Arnold (Merchant Taylors'), Y. C. Davis (Dulwich); *Sc.* Sch. F. H. Windsor (Owen's). *Sidney*: *Mth.* Sc. T. C. Hudson (City of London), W. H. Mitchell (Bristol), H. M. R. Dennis (Chr. Hosp.), *Cl.* Sch. J. Masham (City of London), C. E. Curtis (Ipswich), B. W. Wood (Boston), *Cl.* Exh. F. de W. Lushington (Sutton Valence), C. M. Thornton (Tavistock), *Sc.* Sch. H. Slade (St. Paul's), J. E. Beggs (Manchester), *Sc.* Exh. E. Whichello (Newport).

MACMILLAN AND CO.'S LIST.

RECENT CLASSICAL WORKS.

HOMER.—The Iliad. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by WALTER LEAF, M.A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. 8vo. Vol. I. Books I.—XII. 14s. [Vol. II. in preparation.]

AESCHYLUS.—The Seven against Thebes. Edited, with Introduction, Commentary, and Translation, by A. W. VERRALL, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

JUVENAL.—Thirteen Satires of Juvenal. With a Commentary. By J. E. B. MAYOR, M.A., Professor of Latin in the University of Cambridge. Crown 8vo. Vol. I. *** Fourth Edition, revised and enlarged. 10s. 6d. Vol. II. Second Edition. 10s. 6d.

The new matter in this edition consists of an Introduction (pp. 1—53), Additional Notes (pp. 333—466), and Index (pp. 467—526). It is also issued separately, as a Supplement to the previous edition, at 5s.

PLATO.—Timaeus. Edited, with Introduction and Notes by R. D. ARCHER-HIND, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. 8vo. [In the press.]

CAESAR.—The Gallic War. Edited, after Kraner, by A. S. WALPOLE, M.A., and Rev. JOHN BOND, M.A. Fcap. 8vo, 6s. [Classical Series.]

OVID.—Metamorphoses. Books XIII. and XIV. Edited, with Introduction, Analysis, and Notes, by C. SIMMONS, M.A., formerly of Balliol College, Classical Master in University College School, London. Fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d. [Classical Series.]

TACITUS.—The Histories. Books I. and II. Edited, with Introductions and Notes, by A. D. GODLEY, M.A., Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford. Fcap. 8vo, 5s. [Classical Series.]

ARISTOTLE.—The Rhetoric. Translated with an Analysis and Critical Notes, by the Rev. J. E. C. WELLDON, M.A., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, Head Master of Harrow. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THIRD EDITION, REVISED AND ENLARGED.

RAMBLES AND STUDIES IN GREECE. By J. P. MAHAFFY, Author of "Social Life in Greece" &c. With Illustrations. Third Edition, Revised and Enlarged. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

AN EASTER VACATION IN GREECE. With Lists of books on Greek Travel and Topography, and Time-tables of Greek Railways and Steamers. By JOHN EDWIN SANDYS, Litt. D., Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College, and Public Orator in the University of Cambridge. With a Map of Greece, and a Plan of Olympia. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Macmillan & Co.'s Descriptive Catalogue of New Educational Books is Now Ready, Post Free on Application.

Verlag von CARL KONEGEN IN WIEN.

Bühler, Prof. Dr. G.—Leitfaden für den Elementarunterricht des Sanskrit. Mit Übungsstücken und zwei Glossaren. Preis M. 5.

Hoffmann, Em.—Studien auf dem Gebiete der lateinischen Syntax. Preis M. 3 Pf. 60.

Krichenbauer, A.—Theogonie und Astronomie. Ihr Zusammenhang nachgewiesen an den Göttern der Griechen, Aegypter, Babylonier und Arier. Preis M. 12.

Müller-Strübing, H.—Thukydideische Forschungen. Preis M. 7.

P. OVIDI NASONIS HEROIDES.—Apparatu critico instructi et editi Henricus Stephanus Sedlmayer. Preis M. 5.

Zu beziehen durch alle Buchhandlungen.

Verlag von Wilhelm Engelmann in Leipzig

BIBLIOTHECA SCRIPTORUM CLASSICORUM

herausgegeben

von

WILHELM ENGELMANN.

Achte Auflage, umfassend die Literatur von 1700 bis 1878.

neu bearbeitet von

DR. E. PREUSS.

1. Abtheilung: **Scriptores Graeci**. gr. 8. 1880. geh. M. 20. geb. M. 21. 50.

2. Abtheilung: **Scriptores Latini**. gr. 8. 1882. geh. M. 16. geb. M. 17. 50.

Ausgabe auf Schreibpapier: I. Abth. M. 25; II. Abth. M. 20.

Zu beziehen durch alle Buchhandlungen des In- und Auslandes.

Verlag von FERDINAND SCHÖNINGH, Paderborn.

Sorben erschienen und durch alle Buchhandlungen zu beziehen.

Sophocles, I. Oidipus tyrannos. Erklärt von J. HOLUB. Mit einer Abbildung. 105 S. 8°. M. 1.50.

Holub geht bei der Feststellung des Textes von der Behauptung aus, der Cod. LA sei auf die Art entstanden, dass der Text aus einem fast fehlerfreien Archetypus von einem Griechen dictirt wurde.

A Rough List of Editions of Greek and Latin Authors, Profane and Ecclesiastical, and of Works on the Language, Literature, Art, History, and Religion of Greece and Rome (many scarce and valuable), chiefly from the libraries of the late RECTOR OF LINCOLN, the DEAN OF LINCOLN, and the REV. W. G. COOKESLEY, on sale at the offered net prices by D. NUTT, 270, Strand, London.

ABHANDLUNGEN (Sprachwissenschaftliche), hervorgegangen aus G. Curtius' Grammatischer Gesellschaft. 8vo. Leipzig, 1871. 2s.

ÆSCHINIS in Ctesiphontem et DEMOSTHENIS de coronationibus, commentario instr. J. H. Bremi. 8vo. London, 1857. Calf. 2s. 6d.

ÆSCHYLI tragoediae, comment. illustr. Ch. G. Schütz. 2 vols., 8vo. Oxonii, 1810. Sewed. 3s.

— Agamemnon, emend., notas et glossarium adjecit C. J. Blomfield. Ed. V. 8vo. London, 1839. Half-bound, interleaved, and with numerous manuscript notes. 3s. 6d.

— Agamemnon. With notes by Th. W. Peile. 8vo. London, 1839. Calf. 2s. 6d.

— Eumenides. Recens. et illustr. Jac. Scholefield. 8vo. Cantabr. 1842.—Eumenides rec. et notis instr. Guil. Linwood. Oxonii, 1844. In one volume. 8vo. Half-bound. 1s. 6d.

ÆSOPUS. Fabulae Aesopicae, quales ante Planudem feruntur, ex et lat. ed. ill. F. de Furia. Ed. major. 8vo. Lips. 1819. Calf. gilt. 5s. 6d.

AKEN (A. F.). Die Grundzüge der Lehre vom Temper und Moos im Griechischen, historisch und vergleichend ausgestellt. 8vo. Rostock, 1861. 1s. 6d.

ALCUINI, Abbat. Caroli Magni, Opera post D. Andream Quercetanum edita et illustravit Frobenius. 2 vols. in 3. folio. Batisbon, 1777. Best edition, clean and sound copy, in full calf, gilt back, red edges. £2 2s.

ALEXANDRI APHRODISIENSIS Quaestiones naturales, de anima, morales, graecae. Ed. V. Trincavelli. Folio. Venetiis, 1536. Boards. 12s. 6d.

ALLATI (L.). In antiquitatum Etruscarum fragmenta ab Inghiramo edita a malversationes, add. ejusd. animadversione in libros Alph. Ciesarelli et auctores ab eo contestes. 16mo. Romae, 1642. Vellum. 1s. 6d.

ANACREONTIS carmina, graecae, cum notis Guil. Baxteri scilicet ed. J. P. Fischer. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1793. Half-bound. 3s. 6d.

ANTHOLOGIA graeca, ex rec. Brunckii, indices et comment. adjecit F. Jacobs. 13 vols. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1794—1814. Half-bound. £2 12s. 6d.

APOLLONIUS Dyseolus de pronomine. Ed. I. Bekker. 8vo. Berol., 1813. Cloth. 2s.

APOLLONIUS von Perga, Sieben Bücher über Kegelschnitte nebst dem durch Halley wiederhergestellten 8. Buch. Deutsch bearbeitet von H. Balsam. Mit Anhang. 8vo. Berlin, 1861. 31 plates. Sewed. 5s. 6d.

ARISTOPHANIS Nubes cum scholiis, rec. I. Bekker. Cum notis variorum. 8vo. London, 1826. Half-bound. 2s. 6d.

— The Clouds, with notes, by T. Mitchell. 8vo. London, 1838. Calf. 2s.

— The Wasps, with notes, by T. Mitchell. 8vo. London, 1835. Half-bound. 2s.

— Scholia Graeca in Aristophanis comedias ed. Guil. Dindorf. 3 vols. in 2. 8vo. Lips. 1822. Half calf. 10s. 6d.

ARISTOTELES, Metaphysik. Grundtext, Übersetzung und Commentar nebst erläuternden Abhandlungen von A. Schwegler. 4 vols. in 2. 8vo. Tübingen, 1847-48. Calf extra. £1 16s.

— Rhetorica ad fidem manuscriptorum. 8vo. Oxoniae, 1826. Half calf, interleaved. 1s.

— Excerpta ex Organo, de simplicibus terminis, de propositione et de syllogismo. Acc. Pselli de quinque vocibus liber. Gr. et Lat. 8vo. Oxonii, 1802. Half-bound. 1s.

— Physique, traduite en français, avec des notes perpetuelles par J. Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire. 2 vols. 8vo. Paris, 1862. Half-calf. Out of print and rare. £1 1s.

[—] ACCIAJOLI (Donatus) Expositio super libros Ethicorum Aristotelis in novam translationem Jo. Argyropoli Bituntini. Fol. Florentinae (Jacobus de Ripoli) 1478. Half-bound. £2 10s.

*. A beautiful and rare edition, printed in long lines (32 to the page), in bold Roman characters. This copy has a few marginal notes in an old hand.

- [ARISTOTELES] AFZELIUS (F. G.) Aristotelis de imputatione actionum doctrina. Upsalæ 1841.—Stahr (Ad) Aristoteles bei den Römern. Leipzig, 1834. 8vo. Half-calf. **3s. 6d.**
- [—] ALEXANDRI Aphrodis. Commentarius in libros Metaphysicos Aristotelis. Rec. H. Bonitz. 8vo. Berolini, 1847. Half-calf. **5s.**
- [—] BALDUS (Camillus) In physiognomia Aristotelis comment. fol. Bononiæ 1621. Engraved title. With Episcopal arms on the sides. Calf. Fine copy. **8s. 6d.**
- [—] BUCCAFERREAE (LUD.) Praelectiones in I. librum Physices Aristotelis. Folio. In Academia Veneta, 1558. *Fine tall copy in green morocco, gilt edges, and richly gilt sides, the last leaves very slightly mended.* **£1 1s.**
- [—] CABEI (Nic.) in Meteorologica commentaria. 4 vols. in 2. fol. Romæ 1646. Calf. From Dr. Parr's library. **15s.**
- [—] CLICHTOVEUS (J.) Introductio in X libros Ethicorum Aristotelis, adjectis commentariis. Editio II. Parhisiis, Henr. Stephanus, 1512.—ARISTOTELIS opus de Moribus, triplici conversione latina: Argypopili Byzant., Leon. Aretini, et antiqua, adjecto familiari Jac. Stapulensis commentario. Folio. *Ibid.* 1510. Black letter. *Curious woodcut on the title.* Calf. **10s. 6d.**
- [—] DUNS SCOTI (Jo.) Commentaria in XII libros Metaphysicæ et conclusiones 378 ex eadem. fol. Venetiis, Sim. de Luere, 1503.—ANT. TROMBETÆ opus in Metaphysicam. fol. Venetiis, B. de Locatellis, 1502.—EJUSDEM in tractatum formalitatum Scoti sententia.—ANT. SYRETI formalitates de mente Scoti, necnon Steph. Burlifer cum novis additionibus Magistri Maur. Hiberni. fol. *Ibid.*, 1502.—GAJETANI in libros de coelo et mundo. fol. Venetiis, 1498. In one vol. Boards. **£1 1s.**
- [—] VATER (J. S.) Animadversiones et lectiones ad Aristotelis Rhetoricam, cum auctario J. A. Wolf. 8vo. Lipsiæ, 1794. Boards. **1s.**
- ARRIANI expeditio Alexandri et historia Indica. Graece et latine cum annotationibus et indice G. Raphaelii. 8vo. Amsterdam, 1757. Morocco. **4s. 6d.**
- ARTEMIDORI Oneirocritica, rec. emend. notis Rigaltii et J. J. Reiskii suisque ill. J. G. Reiff. 2 vols. 8vo. Lipsiæ, 1805. Calf. **6s. 6d.**
- Ἀθηναίων Σύγγραμμα περιοδικόν. 10 vols. 8vo. Athens 1873—82. Plates. Complete set of this important periodical, full of archæological, topographical and philological papers. **£5.**
- ATHENAEUS, ex recensione Guil. Dindorfii. 3 vols. 8vo. Lipsiæ 1827. Half calf gilt, uncut. **£1 1s.**
- AUSONII Opera, rec. J. Tollius, cum notis variorum. 8vo. Amstelodami, 1671. Vellum. **2s. 6d.**
- BECKMANN (J.), de historia naturali veterum libellus. 12mo. Petropoli, 1766. **1s.**
- BEHR (Baron). Recherches sur l'histoire des temps héroïques de la Grèce. 8vo. Paris, 1856. 5 Maps. **3s. 6d.**
- BEKKER (I.), Homerische Blätter. 8vo. Bonn, 1863. cloth, uncut. **3s.**
- BEMMELEN (J. F. van), de M. Livii Drusis patre et filio tribunis plebis. 8vo. Lugduni Bat., 1826. **1s. 6d.**
- BENARY (A. A.) Die römische Lautlehre sprachvergleichend dargestellt. Vol. I. (all published). 8vo. Berlin, 1837. **2s. 6d.**
- BERNHARDY (G.), Grundriss der Römischen Litteratur. 5. Bearbeitung. 8vo. Braunschweig, 1872. Calf, gilt. Mark Pattison's copy. **13s. 6d.**
- BIBLIA POLYGLOTTA, studio et labore E. Hutteri. In six languages, the first five of which: Hebrew, Chaldee, Greek, Latin and German, are the same in all editions, whilst the sixth varies according to the country for which the edition is intended. The following volumes are in stock: Pentateuchus, *Sclavonice*; Pentateuchus, *Italice*; Pentateuchus, *Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Saxonice* (i.e. Low German). All folio, Norimbergæ, 1599. *Hogskin and Vellum*, each **£1 1s.**
- The same. Gospels and Acts of the Apostles in Syriac, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, German, Bohemian, Italian, Spanish, French, English, Danish, Polish. Folio, Norimbergæ, 1599. Vellum. *With large folding woodcut portrait of our Lord.* **£1 5s.**
- Hebraice, Graece et Latine, cum annotationibus Fr. Vatabli. 2 Volumes, Folio, Heidelbergæ, 1587. *Magnificent copy in stamped hogskin with clasps.* **£2 2s.**
- BIBLIORUM SACRORUM LATINAE VERSIONES ANTIQUAE seu Vetus Italica, quae cum Vulgata Latina, et cum Textu Graeco comparantur. Acc. Praefationes, Observationes et Notae, studio D. P. Sabatii, O.S.B. 3 volumes, folio, Paris, 1751. *Very fine copy in mottled calf.* **£18.**
- BIBLIA GRAECE. Vetus Testamentum ex versione LXX Interpretum ed. Lamb. Bos. 4to. Fraequeuræ, 1709. *Maps. Vellum.* **7s. 6d.**
- Novum Testamentum idiomate graeco litterali et graeco vulgari: et versione Musimi Calliopolitani. 2 vols. 4to. Genevæ, P. Chouet, 1638. *Dutch Vellum, rare.* **18s.**
- Another copy in calf. **15s.**
- Testamentum Novum Graece, tertium edidit Erasmus Roterodamus. Folio. Basileæ, 1523. Oak boards Wormed. **£1 1s.**
- BIBLIOTHECA GRAECO-LATINA veterum Patrum antiquorumque Scriptorum ecclesiasticorum, cura et studio A. Gallandii. 14 vols. fol. Venetiis, 1765-88. *Fine Copy in calf extra.* **£50.**
- * * Contains the works of 350 writers, of which 180 are not comprised in the earlier editions of the Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum.
- BLUM (K. L.) Herodot und Ktesias, die frühesten Geschichtsforscher des Orients. 8vo. Heidelberg, 1836. Half-bound. **2s.**
- BÖCKH (Aug.) Metrologische Untersuchungen über Gewichte, Münzfüsse und Maasse des Alterthums. 8vo. Berlin, 1838. Half-bound. **5s.**
- BOETHII Consolatio philosophiae; ejusd. opuscula sacra. Cum notis Jo. Bernartii, Theod. Sitzmani et R. Vallini. 8vo. Lugduni, 1671. Sewed. **1s.**
- Consolation de la philosophie. Traduction grecque de Maxime Planude publ. par E. A. Bétant. 8vo. Genève, 1871. Sewed. **3s.**
- BÖTTICHER (Wilh.) Geschichte der Carthager. 8vo. Berlin, 1827. Map. Sewed. **5s.**
- BÖTIGER (C. A.), Sabina oder Morgenszenen im Putzzimmer einer reichen Römerin. 2 vols. in 1. 12mo. Leipzig, 1806. 13 plates. Boards. **18s.**
- BRANDIS (Chr. Aug.) Handbuch der Geschichte der Griechisch-Römischen Philosophie. 3 vols. in 8. 8vo. Berlin, 1835-66. Half-calf, gilt. *Fine Copy.* **£22. 2s.**
- BURLEY (Walter) Vitae omnium philosophorum et poetarum cum auctoritatibus et sententiis aureis eorumdem annexis. 12mo. (Paris, Jean Petit), no date. Petit's device on title page. Old calf. **10s. 6d.**
- BURNEY (C.) Tentamen de metris ab Aeschilo in choricis cantibus adhibitibus. 8vo, Cantabrigiae, 1809. Half bound. **2s. 6d.**
- CAESARIS (C. JULII) Commentarii de bello gallico [et reliqua opera]. Small folio. Tarvisii, M. Manzolinus, 1480. Vellum. *Very tall, perfectly sound and clean copy of this rare edition, a copy of which fetched £9 in the Sunderland sale.* **£3 3s.**
- Commentarii, rec. optimorum codicum auctoritates annot. C. Nipperdeius. Editio major. 8vo, Lipsiæ, 1847. Calf. **£1 10s.**
- CALLIMACHI hymni, epigrammata et fragmenta. Graece et latine, c. notis variorum ed. Jo. Aug. Ernesti. 2 Vols. 8vo, Lugduni Bat. 1761. Old Calf. **4s. 6d.**
- CASSIODORI Opera omnia ed. D. J. Garetius. 2 vols. Fol. Rouen, 1679. *Fine copy in old Calf.* **18s.**
- CATULLI (C. Valerii) Carmina illustr. F. Guil. Doering, 8vo, Altona, 1834, Half-bound. **10s. 6d.**
- CESNOLA (Maj. Alex. Palma di), Antiquities excavated by him at Cyprus during the years 1876-1879. Oblong fol. London, 1881. 60 Photographic Plates containing upwards of 1000 subjects. Red morocco with clasp. **£1 10s.**
- CHASSANG (A.) Histoire du Roman et de ses rapports avec l'histoire dans l'antiquité grecque et latine. 8vo. Paris, 1862. Sewed. **4s.**
- CHRIST (W.) Grundzüge der griechischen Lautlehre. 8vo. Leipzig, 1859. Sewed. **4s.**
- CICERO (M. TULLIUS) Manucciorum commentariis illustr. antiquaeque lectioni restitutus. 10 vols. in 5. Folio. Venetiis, apud Aldos, 1582-83. *Vellum, red edges.* **15s.**
- Epistolae, rec. illustr. C. G. Schütz. 6 vols. 8vo. Halae, 1809-12. Calf extra. **£1 1s.**
- another copy, 6 vols. in 3, half bound. **18s.**
- Epistles to Atticus, translated into English with notes by W. Guthrie. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1752. Old calf. **1s. 6d.**
- Oratio pro Plancio, emend. et explan. Ed. Wunder. 4to. Lipsiæ, 1830. Calf. **5s.**

CICERONIS Verrinarum libri VII., rec. et explic. C. T. Zumptius. Editio Major. 8vo, Berolini, 1831. Calf extra. **8s. 6d.**

— Brutus, rec., emend., interpretatus est F. Ellendt. 8vo. Regiomonti 1844. Calf extra. **4s. 6d.**

— De Oratore, rec. et explic. F. Ellendt. 2 vols. 8vo. Regiomonti, 1840. Calf. **14s. 6d.**

— De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum. Rec. et enarrauit J. Nic. Madvigius. 8vo. Hauniae, 1839. Calf extra. **7s. 6d.**

— Laelius sive de amicitia. Mit Commentar von M. Seyffert. 8vo. Brandenburg, 1844. Calf extra. **3s.**

— Tusculanae Disputationes, cum notis variorum suisque ed. G. H. Moser. 3 vols. 8vo. Hanover, 1836. Calf extra. **8s.**

COMPTES-RENDUS de la Commission Impériale Archéologique pour les années 1859 à 1880. 20 vols. Text in small folio. Atlas in Royal folio. Petersburg, 1860-82. Complete as far as published. Rare. **£35.**

CORNUTUS (L. Annaeus), de natura deorum rec. comm. instr. F. Osannus. 8vo. Göttingae, 1844. Half Calf. Mark Pattison's copy. **8s. 6d.**

— Another copy in boards. **7s. 6d.**

CORSEN (W.) Über Aussprache, Vokalismus und Betonung der lateinischen Sprache. Second Edition. 8vo, Leipzig, 1868. Half-calf gilt. 2 vols. **£4 4s.**

COULANGES (Fustel de). La Cité antique. Etude sur le culte, le droit, les institutions de la Grèce et de Rome, Eighth Edition. 8vo, Paris, 1880. Cloth, **2s. 6d.**

CREUZER (FRID.) Dionysus seu commentationes de rerum Bacchicarum Orphicarumque originibus et causis. Vol. I. (all published.) 4to. Heidelberg, 1809. 6 Plates. **3s. 6d.**

— Meletemata e disciplina antiquitatis. 3 vols. in one. 8vo. Leipzig, 1817. Half-bound. **5s.**

— Abriss der römischen Antiquitäten. Second Edition. 8vo. Leipzig, 1829. Boards. **1s.**

CURTIVS (E.) Attische Studien. 2 parts. Göttingen, 1862-65. 3 Plates.—WIESELER (F.) de loco, quo ante theatrum Bachi lapideum exstructum Athenis acti sint ludii scenici. Göttingen, 1860.—SAUPPE (H.) de demis urbanis Athenarum. Lipsiae, 1846.—CURTIUS (C.) das Metroon in Athen als Staatsarchiv. Berlin, 1868.—MUELLER (C. O.) de Phidiae vita et operibus. Plate. Göttingen, 1827. In 1 vol. 4to, cloth. **15s.**

CURTIVS Rufus de rebus gestis Alexandri Magni rec. F. Schmieder. 8vo. Göttingae, 1803. Half bound. **2s. 6d.**

DALZEL (A.) Collectanea graeca majora cum notis philologicis. Ed. VIII. 5 vols. 8vo. London, 1817. Calf. **3s.**

DAMM (CH. T.) Novum lexicon graecum etymologicum et reale Homericum et Pindaricum. Editio nova cura Io. M. Duncan. 4to. Glasgae, 1821. Old calf. **5s.**

DAWES (R.) Miscellanea critica iterum ed. Th. Burgess. 8vo. Oxonii, 1781. Boards. **2s.**

DEMOSTHENIS Philippicae, ed. illustr. et indices adjecit C. A. Ruediger. 2 parts in 1 vol. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1829-33. Calf. **2s. 6d.**

— Oratio in Midiam, cum annot. cur. Phil. Buttmannus. 8vo. Berol. 1823. Half-bound. **1s.**

DIONIS CHRYSOSTOMI Orationes, ex rec. J. J. Reiskii. Cum notis variorum et Morelli scholiis. 2 vols. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1798. Calf. **6s.**

DIODORI SICULI Bibliothecae historicae libri qui supersunt, gr. et lat., interprete L. Rhodmano, recensuit P. Wesseling. 2 vols. folio. Amstelodami, 1746. Beautiful engraved frontispiece and portrait. Fine tall copy in calf. **15s.**

DIONYSII HALICARNASSENSIS Antiquitatum Romanarum libri quotquot supersunt, graeco et latine, ed. Joa. Hudson. 2 vols. folio. Oxoniae, 1794. Fine copy in calf. **12s. 6d.**

DIOSCORIDIS libri octo, graece et latine. 12mo. Parisiis, P. Haultinus, 1549. Half-bound. **3s. 6d.**

DONALDSON (W.) Varroianus: a critical and historical introduction to the philological study of the Latin language. 8vo. Cambridge, 1848. Cloth. **2s.**

DRUMANN (W.) Geschichte Roms in seinem Uebergang von der republicanischen zur monarchischen Verfassung. 6 vols. 8vo. Königsberg, 1834-44. Half calf gilt. Rare. **£3 15s.**

DUCHALAIS (Ad.) Description des médailles gauloises faisant partie des collections de la Bibliothèque Royale. 8vo. Paris, 1846. 4 plates. **4s. 6d.**

DÜNTZER (H.) Die Lehre von der lat. Wortbildung und Composition. Köln. 1836.—Ders. Die Deklination der Indogermanischen Sprachen. Köln, 1839.—SCHWENCK (Konr.) Beitrag zur Wortforschung der lat. Sprache. 2 The. Frankfurt, 1833. In 1 vol. 8vo. Half bound. **3s. 6d.**

ENGEL (W. H.) Kypros. 2 vols. 8vo. Berlin, 1841. Boards. **£1 1s.**

EPICTETI Enchiridium, una cum Cebetis tabula. Graece et lat. cum notis variorum suisque ed. A. Berkelius. 8vo. Delphis Batav., 1683. Vellum. **5s. 6d.**

EPIGRAMMATUM Graecarum libri VII, graece, annotationibus Joa. Brodaei illustrati. Folio, Basilene. 1549. Calf. **8s. 6d.**

[EPIGRAMMATA.] Sylloge epigrammatum Graecarum, collegit F. Th. Welcker. With appendix and plate. 8vo. Bonn, 1828-29. Half-calf. **3s. 6d.**

ERNESTI (F. Ch. Th.) Lexicon technologiae Latinorum rhetoricae. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1797. Calf. **5s.**

ETYMOLOGICON MAGNUM. Graece cum praefatione Musuri. Fol. Venetiis (Zacharias Calliergi) 1499. Old red Russia, rebound. **£6 6s.**

*** Remarkably fine and tall copy in first-rate interior preservation. Formerly in the library of *Sadoletus*, whose autograph appears on the title-page. With the book plate of the Marquis of Wellesley, to whom the copy was presented by B. Sydenham, "in token of his constant kindness and favour to Thomas Sydenham."

EURIPIDIS Tragoediae, ed. A. Witzschel. 3 vols. 8vo. Lipsiae, B. Tauchnitz, 1855. Cloth uncut. Vellum paper. Out of print. **10s. 6d.**

— Tragoediae, rec. et commentariis instr. A. J. E. Pflugk. Vol. I. II. (Medea—Hecuba—Andromache—Heraclidae—Helena—Alcestis—Hercules furens—Phoenissae). 8vo. Gotha, 1830-31. Calf. **3s. 6d.**

— Tragoediae priores quatuor (Hecuba, Orestes, Phoenissae, Medea) cum notis Ric. Porson suisque ed. J. Scholefield. 8vo. Cantabrigiae, 1829. Boards, uncut. **2s. 6d.**

— Heraclidae et Medea, ex recens. P. Elmsley cum notis variorum. Ed. II. 8vo. Oxoniae, 1828. Calf. **3s.**

— Helena, Rec. God. Hermannus. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1837. Half-bound. **1s. 6d.**

[—] DINDORF (Guil.) Animadversiones in Euripidis tragoediis. 2 vols., 8vo. Oxonii, 1839-40. Boards, uncut. **4s.**

FABRICII (J. A.) Bibliotheca Graeca. 14 vols. in 8. 4to. Hamburg. 1705-28. Vellum. **£1 5s.**

FESTI quae supersunt, cum Pauli epitome, emendata et annotata a C. O. Mueller. Oblong 4to. Lips., 1839. Half-bound. Rare. **£1 16s.**

FETES et Courtisanes de la Grèce. Supplement au Voyages d'Anacharsis et d'Antenor, comprenant la chronique religieuse des anciens Grecs, la chronique scandaleuse, un Almanach Athénien, etc. 4th edition. 4 vols., 8vo. Paris, 1821. Plates and Music. Half-bound. **£1 1s.**

FLORI (L. Annaei) Epitome rerum Romanarum cum notis variorum suisque ed. C. A. Duker. 8vo. Lugduni Bat., 1722. Dutch vellum. **3s.**

— Another Copy in Old Calf. **2s. 6d.**

FORCHHAMMER (P. W.), Hellenika. Griechenland im neuen das alte. Bd. I. (all published.) 8vo. Berlin, 1837. Plate and Maps. Sewed. **3s.**

FOURTOUL (H.), Etudes d'archéologie et d'histoire. 2 vols. 8vo. Paris, 1854. Sewed. **4s. 6d.**

FRENSDORFF (Emile) Etudes sur Eschyle. T. I. 8vo. Bruxelles, 1846. Sewed. **1s. 6d.**

FRITSCH (E. A.) Vergleichende Bearbeitung der griechischen und lateinischen Partikeln. 8vo. Giessen, 1856-58. Sewed. **3s.**

GELLI (Auli) Noctes Atticae cum selectis novisque commentariis ex accurata rec. A. Thysi et J. Oiseli. 8vo. Lugduni Bat. 1666. Calf. **3s.**

— Noctes Atticae cum annotationibus ed. Lion. 2 vols. 8vo. Goettingae, 1824. Half Calf. **4s.**

GIDEL (A. Ch.) Etudes sur la littérature grecque moderne. 8vo. Paris, 1866. Sewed. **7s. 6d.**

- GLADISCH (Aug.) Empedocles und die Aegypter. Mit Erläuterungen von H. Brugsch und J. Passalacqua. Svo. Leipzig, 1858. Sewed. **2s. 6d.**
- GREGORII (S., Turonensis) Opera omnia; neenon Fredegarii Scholastici Epitome et Chronicon. Studio Dom. Th. Ruinart. fol. Lutetiae Paris., 1699. Calf. **£1 16s.**
- HAGEN (H.) Zur Geschichte der Philologie und zur römischen Literatur. Svo. Berlin, 1879. **4s. 6d.**
- HEGEWISCH (D. H.) Historischer Versuch über die römischen Finanzen. Svo. Altona, 1804. **1s.**
- HEIMSOETH (Friedr.) Kritische Studien zu den griech. Tragikern. Abtheil. I. (all published.) Svo. Bonn, 1865. Sewed. **3s. 6d.**
- HERMANN (Gotfr.) Opuscula. 8 vols. Svo. Lipsiae, 1827—77. Half calf. **£2 2s.**
- HERODOTI historiarum libri ix, opera F. W. Reizii. 2 vols. Svo. Oxonii, 1808. Half-bound. **3s. 6d.**
- historiarum libri ix, opera F. W. Reizii. 2 vols. 16mo. Londini, 1822. Boards, uncut. **2s. 6d.**
- HERWERDEN (Henricus van): Nova addenda critica ad Meinekii Fragmenta Comicorum graecorum.—Plutarchea et Lucianea.—Oratio de moribus Graecorum aetate Homerica.—Lapidum de dialecto Attica testimonia. Svo. Trajecti ad Rh., 1864-80. Each **1s. 6d.**
- HESIODI quae extant, ex rec. Th. Robinsoni, cum notis variorum ed. Ch. F. Loesner. Svo. Lipsiae, 1778. Calf. **2s.**
- Carmina, rec. et annot. C. Goettling. Svo. Gothae, 1843. Cloth. **3s.**
- HESYCHII Milesii opuscula duo et Cardinalis BESARIONIS epistola de educandis filiis Jo. Palaeologi, graece et latine, ed. J. C. Orelli. Svo. Lipsiae, 1820. Half calf. **3s. 6d.**
- HILDEBERTI (Ven.) Opera, acc. MARBODI Opuscula, ed. D. Ant. Beaugendre. Folio. Paris, 1708. Old calf. Best Benedictine edition. **15s.**
- HOECK (Karl) Kreta von den ältesten Zeiten bis auf die Römer-Herrschaft. 3 vols. Svo. Göttingen, 1823-29. Half bound. Map and two plates. **£1 1s.**
- HOFFMANN (S. J. W.) Griechenland und die Griechen im Alterthum. 2 vols. Svo. Leipzig, 1841. Half bound. **6s.**
- HOMERI Ilias et Odyssea, ex recogn. Imm. Bekkeri. 2 vols. in 1. Svo. Berolini, 1843. Calf. **4s. 6d.**
- Carmina. I. Bekker emendabat et annotabat. 2 vols. Svo. Bonn, 1858. Cloth. **7s. 6d.**
- Ilias cum lectionibus, scholiis et versione latina ed. C. G. Heyne. 8 vols. Svo. Lipsiae, 1802. Calf. **10s. 6d.**
- Die Homerische Odyssee in ihrer ursprünglichen Sprachform wiederhergestellt. Von A. Fick. Svo. Göttingen, 1883. Sewed. **9s.**
- HORATIUS, Satiren erklärt von L. F. Heindorf. Svo. Reutlingen, 1818. Half bound. **1s.**
- HÜBNER (Aemilius), Inscriptiones Hispaniae Christianae. 4to. Berolini, 1871. Cum tabula geogr. Boards. **6s.**
- HUSCHKE (Ph. E.) Das alte römische Jahr und seine Tage. (Römische Studien, I.) Svo. Breslau, 1869. **3s.**
- IRENAEI (S., Episcopi Lugd.) Opera, studio et labore R. Massuet, O.S.B. 2 vols. fol. Venetiis, 1734. Calf. Best Edition. **£1 15s.**
- ISIDORI (S., Hispalensis Episc.) Opera omnia denuo correctae et auctae, rec. F. Arevalo, qui Isidoriana praemisit etc. 7 vols. 4to. Romae, 1797. Spanish calf. **£4 4s.**
- JÖCHER (C. G.) Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexicon. 4 vols. 4to. Leipzig, 1750-51. Vellum. **£1 1s.**
- Indispensable to every philological, historical and theological library.
- JONGH (A. de) Pindarica. Svo. Trajecti ad Rh., 1845. Calf. **3s.**
- JULIANI (Imperatoris) Opera, Graece et Latine. 4to. Paris, 1620. Vellum. **3s. 6d.**
- JURIS CIVILIS ANTEJUSTINIANEI reliquiae ineditae cur. Ang. Maio. Svo. Romae, 1823. Half calf. **2s. 6d.**
- JUSTINI (Martyris) Opera omnia, gr. et lat. Ed. Bened. fol. Paris, 1742. Calf. **£1 5s.**
- JUVENALIS Opus, interprete Joa. Britannico cum Joa. Badii familiaribus explanationibus. Folio. Venetiis, Fr. Bindoni et M. Pasini, 1548. Curious wood engravings. Vellum. **7s. 6d.**
- JUVENALIS Satirae. Item Auli PERSII satirarum liber. Cum notis variorum et commentario Is. Casauboni. 4to. Lugduni Bat., 1695. Dutch vellum. **8s. 6d.**
- Satirae, illustr. G. A. Ruperti. 2 vols. Svo. Lipsiae, 1819. Cloth, uncut. **6s.**
- Satirae, cum commentariis C. T. Heinrichii. Acced. scholia vetera. 2 vols in 1. Svo. Bonnæ, 1839. Half-morocco. **9s.**
- Satirae, cum scholiis veteribus et emend. O. Jahn. Svo. Berolini, 1851. Cloth, uncut. **£1 10s.**
- Thirteen Satires, ed. with English notes by J. E. B. Mayor. Svo. Cambridge, 1853. Cloth. **3s. 6d.**
- In Juvenalis Satiras Commentarii vetusti, notis instr. D. A. G. Cramer. Svo. Hamburg, 1823. Boards. **2s. 6d.**
- KÖNE (J. R.) Über die Sprache der römischen Epiker. Svo. Münster, 1841. Sewed. **1s. 6d.**
- KORTÜM (F.) Zur Geschichte hellenischer Staatsverfassungen hauptsächlich während des peloponnesischen Kriegs. Svo. Heidelberg, 1831. Half-bound. **1s. 6d.**
- KRAUSE (J. H.) Angeiologie. Die Gefässe der alten Völker insbesondere der Griechen und Römer. Svo. Halle, 1854. 6 plates. Cloth. **7s. 6d.**
- KRISCHKE (Aug. B.) Die theologischen Lehren der griechischen Denker. Eine Prüfung der Darstellung Cicero's Svo. Göttingen, 1840. Cloth. **4s. 6d.**
- KREUSER (J.) Der Hellenen Priesterstaat mit vorzüglicher Rücksicht auf die Hierodulen. Svo. Mainz, 1822. Sewed. **1s. 6d.**
- KRÜGER (G. T. A.) Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiet der lateinischen Sprachlehre, 3 parts. Svo. Braunschweig, 1820-7. Sewed. **2s. 6d.**
- KRUSE (F. C. H.), Hellas oder geographisch—antiquarische Darstellung des alten Griechenlands und seiner Colonien. 2 vols. in 3. Svo. Leipzig, 1825-27. Plates and Maps. Half-bd. **8s. 6d.**
- KÜHNER (R.), Schulgrammatik der griechischen Syntax. Third Edition. Svo. Hannover, 1851. Cloth. **1s.**
- LABOULAYE (E.) Essai sur les lois criminelles des Romains concernant la responsabilité des magistrats. Svo. Paris, 1845. Half-bound. Rare. Mark Pattison's copy. **10s. 6d.**
- LACHMANN (R. H.) Die spartanische Staatsverfassung in ihrer Entwicklung und ihrem Verfall. Svo. Breslau, 1836. Sewed. **3s.**
- LANZI (L.) Saggio di lingua Etrusca e di altre antiche lingue d'Italia. 3 vols. 12mo. Roma, 1789. Half bound. **8s. 6d.**
- LAUER (J. F.) System der griechischen Mythologie. Svo. Berlin, 1853. Boards. **4s. 6d.**
- LE GRIS (Jules) Rome, ses novateurs, ses conservateurs et la monarchie d'Octave Auguste. Etudes historiques sur Lucrèce, Catulle, Virgile, Horace. 2 vols. Svo. Paris, 1846. Half bound. **3s. 6d.**
- LERSCH (Laur.) Antiquitates Vergilianae ad vitam populi Romani descriptae. Svo. Bonnæ, 1843. Half calf. **3s.**
- Die Sprachphilosophie der Alten. 3 vols. in 1. Svo. Bonn, 1838—41. Half bound. **12s. 6d.**
- LETRONNE, Mélanges d'érudition et de critique historique, Svo. Paris (1850). Portrait. Sewed. **3s. 6d.**
- LIVII ('TITI) Historiarum libri qui supersunt, adjunctis scholiis C. Sigonii. Ed. II. Folio. Venetiis, 1566. Calf. **5s. 6d.**
- LUCANI Pharsalia, cum Scholiaste et notis variorum cur. F. Oudendorpius. 4to. Lugduni Bat., 1728. Calf. **8s. 6d.**
- LUCIANI Samosatensis Opera omnia quae extant, graece et latine, cum notis Bourdelotii et aliorum. Folio. Lutetiae Paris, 1615. Calf. **10s. 6d.**
- Opera, cum nova vers. lat. Hemsterhusii et Gesneri, scholiis et notis variorum ed. Tib. Hemsterhusius et J. F. Reitzius. Acced. Lexicon Lucianum a C. C. Reitzio. 4 vols. 4to. Amstelodami et Trajecti ad Rh. 1743—46. Calf. **£1 1s.**
- Opera, ed. Guil. Dindorf. 3 vols. 12mo. Lipsiae, 1858. Sewed. **3s. 6d.**
- LUCRETIUS, de rerum natura, rec. et emend. commentario instr. C. Lachmann. 2 vols. in 1. Svo. Berolini 1850. Cloth, uncut. **5s.**

- LYCOPHRONIS *Alexandra* cum versione latina et comm. Guil. Canteri, illustr. H. G. Reichard. Svo. Lips., 1783.
—Jo. et Is. Tsetzæ Scholia in Lycophronem, emend. et illustr. Ch. G. Müller. 3 vols. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1811. Half calf gilt. **£1 10s**
- LYCURGI *Oratio contra Leocratem*, rec., ill. A. Korai, Gallicam versionem addidit F. Th. Svo. Paris, 1826. Russia, uncut. One of the rarest vols. of the Korai Collection. **8s.**
- LYSLAE quae supersunt, Graece, cum Taylori Marklandi suisque annotationibus ed. J. J. Reiske. 2 vols. 8vo. Lipsiae, 1772. Boards. **9s. 6d**
- *Orationes et fragmenta*, annotatione critica instr. Jo. Franz. Svo. Stuttgart, 1831. Calf. **2s.**
- MACROBII *Opera*, cum notis J. Pontani, J. Meursii, Jac. Gronovii. Svo. Lugduni Bat., 1670. Calf. **5s.**
- MADVIG (J. N.) *Syntax der griechischen Sprache*. Svo. Braunschweig, 1847. Bds. **2s. 6d.**
- MÄRKER (F. A.), *Das Princip des Bösen nach den Begriffen der Griechen*. Svo. Berlin, 1842. Half calf. **5s. 6d.**
- MARTHA (C.) *Les moralistes sous l'empire Romain*. Philosophes et poètes. Svo. Paris, 1865. Sewed. **3s. 6d.**
- MARTIALIS *Epigrammatum libri*, ed. D. F. G. Schneidewin. 2 vols. in one. 8vo. Græcia, 1842. Half calf gilt. **10s. 6d.**
- MARTIANUS CAPELLA *de nuptiis philologiae et Mercurii et de septem artibus liberalibus* ed. cum notis variorum et commentario perpetuo U. F. Kopp. 4to. Francofurti, 1836. Half calf. **7s. 6d.**
- MATTHIES (H. J.), *Disputatio literaria de Epaninonda*. 4to. Lugduni Bat., 1830. **1s. 6d.**
- MENANDRI et PHILEMONIS *Reliquiae*, graece et latine, cum notis H. Grotii et J. Clerici. Svo. Amstelodami, 1709. Half bound. **1s. 6d.**
- MENARD (M.), *Histoire des antiquités de la ville de Nîmes et de ses environs*. Svo. Nîmes, 1819. 14 Plates. Sewed. **1s.**
- MERCKLIN (L.), *Die Cooptation der Römer. Eine sacralrechtliche Abhandlung*. Svo. Mitau, 1848. Sewed. **1s. 6d.**
- METZGER (G. C.), *Memoria Hieron. Wolfii*. Svo. Augustae Vind. 1862. Vellum. **1s. 6d.**
- MOMMSEN (Th.) *Res gestae Divi Augusti*. Ex monumentis Ancyranis et Apolloniensi editae. Roy. Svo. Berol., 1865. 3 plates. Cloth. **4s. 6d.**
- MUSEUM der Alterthumswissenschaft, herausgegeben von F. A. Wolf und Phil. Buttmann. 2 vols. 8vo. Berlin 1807-8. 4 plates. **3s.**
- NEUBAUER (J.) *Cadmilus sive de Cabiromum cultu ac mysteriis*. Svo. Lipsiae 1857. Sewed. **1s. 6d.**
- NICANDRI *Theriaca et Alexipharmaca*, Jo. Gorgaeus latinis versibus reddidit, italicis vero A. M. Salvinus. Cum graeca Eutecni metaphrasi ed. A. M. Bandlinus. Svo. Florentiae, 1791. Calf. **3s.**
- NIEBUHR (B. G.) *Vorträge über alte Länder- und Völkerkunde*, gehalten zu Bonn, herausgegeben von M. Isler. Svo. Berlin, 1851. Calf. **4s. 6d.**
- *Vorträge über alte Geschichte*, zu Bonn gehalten, herausg. von M. Niebuhr. 3 vols. Svo. Berlin, 1847-51. Calf. **12s. 6d.**
- NONNI *Dionysiaca* libri sex (VIII.—XIII.), illustr. G. H. Moser. Praefatus est P. Creuzer. Svo. Heidelberg, 1869. Calf. **2s. 6d.**
- ORIGENIS *Opera omnia*, gr. et lat., ed. H. Lommatsch. 25 vols. in 12. 12mo. Berolini, 1834-45. Half calf gilt. Fine copy. **£4 14s. 6d**
- *Hexaplorum quae supersunt*. Gr. et lat. Notis illustr. D. B. de Montfaucon. 2 vols. fol. Paris, 1713. French calf. **£1 16s**
- *contra Celsum libri VIII. et Gregorii Thaumaturgi Panegyricus in Origenem*, Graece et Latine, ed. D. Hoerschel. 4to. Augsburg, 1695. Calf. **3s. 6d**
- ORIGENI *Opera*, graece et latine, cum notis et indice cur. G. C. Humbberger. Svo. Lipsiae, 1794. Calf. **1s. 6d.**
- OVIUM *Opera*, Cum notis variorum. 3 vols. Svo. Lugduni Bat., 1663-70. Calf. **10s. 6d**
- *Metamorphoses*, rec. et illustr. G. E. Gierig. 2 vols. Svo. Lipsiae, 1804-7. Sewed. **7s. 6d**
- PERSII *Satirae*, rec. et comment. instr. N. L. Achaintre. Svo. Paris, 1812. Morocco. **3s.**
- *Satirae*, cum scholiis antiquis ed. Otto Jahn. Svo. Lipsiae, 1843. Calf. **£1 16s.**
- PETRONII *Satyricon*, cum notis variorum cur. P. Burmannus. 4to. Trajecti ad Rh. 1709. Calf. **7s. 6d.**
- [—] *Chrestomathia Petronio-Burmänniana*, accessit specimen latinitatis novae, Romanis incognitae e notis P. Burmanni ad Petronium. Svo. Florentiae, 1734. Half-bound. Satirical pamphlet against Burmann. **2s. 6d.**
- PHAEDRI *fabulae Aesopiae*, cum novo commentario P. Burmanni. Roy. 4to. Leidae, 1777. Vellum. Fine copy on large paper. **5s.**
- *Fabulae Aesopiae*, ed. illustr. J. G. S. Schwabe. 2 vols. Svo. Brunsvigae, 1806. Calf. **4s. 6d.**
- PHOTII Patriarchi *lectionum collectio*, e codice Galeano descripsit R. Porsonus. (Ed. P. Dobree.) 2 vols. Svo. Cantabrigiae, 1822. Boards, uncut. **5s. 6d.**
- PHRANTZES (G.) *Io. Cananus, Io. Anagnostes*, ex recens. Imm. Bekkeri. Svo. Bonn, 1838. Half calf. **5s. 6d.**
- PINDARI *carmina* ex rec. Boeckhii ed. L. Dissen. Ed. II. cur. F. G. Schneidewin. Sect. I. cont. textum cum annotatione critica. **3s. 6d.**
- PINDAROS' *Werke in die Versmaasse des Originals* übersetzt von Jo. Tycho Mommsen. 4to. Leips., 1846. Calf. **3s. 6d.**
- [—] Kayser (C. L.) *Lectiones Pindaricae*. Svo. Heidelberg, 1840. Calf. **1s. 6d.**
- PLATO'S *Apology of Socrates, Crito and Phaedo*. With the Latin version of Ficinus and notes by C. Stuart Stanford. Svo. Dublin, 1831. Calf. **3s.**
- *Euthydemus et Gorgias*, rec., latine vertit, notisque adj. M. J. Routh. Svo. Oxonii, 1784.—Ejusd. *Parmenides*, graece et latine, studio J. G. Thomson. Svo. Oxonii, 1728.—Ejusd. *V dialogi (Amatores, Eutyphron, Apologia, Crito, Phaedon)*; illustr. N. Forster. Svo. Oxonii, 1765. In 2 vols. Calf. **3s.**
- [—] Chaignet (A. Ed.) *De la psychologie de Platon*. Svo. Paris, 1862. Half mor. **3s. 6d.**
- PLAUTI *Amphitruo—Aulularia—Asinaria*, rec. et illustr. E. J. Richter. 3 vols. Svo. Norimb. 1833. Calf. **4s. 6d.**
- *Comoediae tres. Captivi. Miles gloriosus. Trinummus*. Editio F. Lindemann. Ed. II. Svo. Lipsiae, 1844. Half bound. **4s. 6d.**
- *Trinummus, Captivi, Menaechni*, erklärt von J. Brix. Svo. Leipzig, 1870-73. Half-bound, interleaved. **2s. 6d.**
- *Miles Gloriosus, Mostellaria*, erklärt von A. O. Fr. Lorenz. Svo. Berlin, 1863-66. Half bound, interleaved. **3s. 6d.**
- PLINI SECUNDI (C.) *Naturalis Historia libri XXXVII*, interpretatione et notis illustr. J. Harduinus, S.J. In usum Delphini. 5 vols. 4to. Parisiis, 1685. Calf. **18s.**
- *Naturalis Historia*, cum notis variorum. 3 vols. Svo. Lugduni Bat., 1669. Calf. **7s. 6d.**
- POETAE LATINI MINORES, cur J. Ch. Wernsdorf. 6 vols. in 10. Svo. Helmestadii, 1791-99. Half-bound. **£2 2s.**
- POETAE LYRICI GRAECI. Ed. Theod. Bergk. Svo. Lipsiae, 1843. Calf. **5s.**
- POLLUX (Julius) *Vocabularium*. Graece. Folio. Venetiis, apud Aldum 1592. Calf. Tall, sound and clean copy of the editio princeps. **£1 1s**
- PROPERTII *Elegiae*, cum commentario perpetuo P. Burmanni Secundi et variorum ed. L. Santenius. 4to. Trajecti ad Rh., 1759. Calf, gilt edges. Bound in 2 vols. **7s. 6d.**
- RANGABE (A. R.), *Antiquités Helléniques ou recueils d'inscriptions et d'autres antiquités découvertes depuis l'affranchissement de la Grèce*. 2 vols. 4to. Athens, 1842-56. Half-morocco. **£3 3s.**
- REINHOLD (C. H. Th.), *Noctes Pelasgicae vel symbolae ad cognoscendas dialectos Graeciae Pelasgicas*. Svo. Athenis, 1885. Half-bound. **1s. 6d.**
- RITSCHL (Fr.), *Opuscula philologica*. 5 vols. in 6, and atlas of 23 plates. Svo. Leipzig, 1867-79. Half calf, gilt. **£4 4s.**

The Classical Review

MAY 1887.

THE AEOLIC ELEMENT IN THE *ILIAD* AND *ODYSSEY*.

(Concluded from page 38).

It is not necessary for the purpose of this review to explain the division of the older portions of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* proposed by Fick; nor is it possible to discuss his historical arguments. I need only indicate what appear to me the most important heads of linguistic evidence in favour of the theory. (1) A comparative analysis of the earlier and later Ionic poetry (the line being drawn about the middle of the sixth century) appears to prove¹ that the dialect of the former contains little or nothing of the 'Epic' element found in Homer, whereas in the latter the 'Epic' forms are very numerous and 'fixed' (*i.e.* secured by the metre). For example, in the earlier remains there is not one genuine instance of the Epic *κεν*, nor of the Epic infinitive in *-μεναι*, nor the Epic dative plural in *-εσσι*. On the contrary, we find in Xenophanes *κε* or *κεν* 'fixed' in five places, the genitives *Πισάο*, *Ἀοιδάων*, the Epic *ἐείκοσι*. Anacreon has *πτερύγεσσι*. Phocylides has *ἔμμεναι* three times, and the infinitive in *-μεναι* is of frequent occurrence in the later poets. These facts are all the more striking, because the phraseology of the earlier Ionian poets, apart from the linguistic forms, is frequently 'Homeric.' The Homeric poetry was present to their minds, but they still adhered strictly to the forms of their own dialect. A decided presumption is thus established against ascribing the Homeric poetry to an early Ionian school. (2) That presumption becomes much stronger, if viewed in connection with the disappearance of the digamma from the Ionic dialect at a time when it was still preserved or not altogether lost in the Aeolic and other dialects, including those of Northern Greece. And the proof of this is now as nearly

as possible complete. As far back as the earliest Ionic literature and the earliest Ionic inscriptions extend, there is no certain trace of this letter. It is never recognised in the oldest of the Ionian poets, except where they borrow Homeric phrases. As regards the inscriptions, the only apparent exception of any importance is one from Naxos, where the digamma does not appear as an independent letter, but is erroneously used in spelling a diphthong (*ἄφυτο* for *ἄυτο* = *αὐτοῦ*). All the evidence leads to the conclusion that the Ionian Greeks, with the possible exception of the Euboean branch, had dropped the digamma as early as the eighth century or even the ninth. (3) Though it is impossible, without much more documentary evidence than we can hope to recover, to reconstruct an old-Aeolian dialect, which would include the Boeotian and Thessalian with the Lesbian branches—still less one extensive enough to be denoted 'Achaean'—yet collateral evidence of genuine value for the question of the Homeric poetry has been obtained through the various dialects which, on historical grounds, may be brought into more or less close relationship with the Aeolic. Thus, something of the pre-Doric dialect of Argos and Laconia may be gleaned from the conservative dialects of Arcadia and Cyprus, and something of the earlier language of Boeotia and Thessaly survives in the inscriptions from those districts. Fick has noticed (*Odyssee*, p. 325 ff. *Ilias*, p. 546 ff.) in the Cyprian (prose) inscriptions several remarkable instances of Homeric words which are found elsewhere only in poetry, *e.g.* *αὐτάρ*, *ιδέ*, *Φάραξ*, *αἶσα* (in the sense of 'part' or 'share'), and other words not found except in Homer, *e.g.* *εὐχολᾶς*, *ἰγλήραν* (Homeric *ιγλήρ*), *ἑνιπιά* (Homeric *ἐνιπή*), *χρανόμενον*; the name *Θεάρωρ* corresponding with the Homeric *Θεαρῶ* (*Θεαινῶ*, abbreviated from *Θεάνειρα*);

¹ See Fick, *Die sprachform der altionischen und altattischen lyrik*, Bezzenberger's Beiträge, vol. xi. p. 242 ff.

the name Πινυτ-αγόρας recalling the Homeric πέπνυται. The Homeric πτόλις is found in Cyprian and Arcadian inscriptions, and a Thessalian inscription has πτόλις. The Homeric μέσφα (or μέσπα) appears to be comparable with the Thessalian μέσποδι and Arcadian μέσπε ('twice'). A Thessalian inscription has τᾶμον (Homeric τῆμος). In Arcadian inscriptions are found δέατοι (cf. Homeric δέατο), ἀπνέσθω (cf. ἡπύω), πανθυμαδόν (cf. ὁμοθυμαδόν).

I venture to add what seems to me a possible confirmation of the argument from a different point of view, viz. that of the metre. The history of the Epic metre is still in the region of conjecture. But the theory recently published by Mr. F. A. Allen,¹ which connects its origin with that of the Saturnian verse, appears to be well founded, and it has an important bearing on the question of the Homeric language. According to this theory, the hexameter line consisted at first of two separate tripodies, as indicated by the caesura, the first having a catalectic ending (probably always -), the second commencing with an anacrusis. The Saturnian line is similarly divisible, and each half has likewise a triple ictus: e.g. Gnaivód patrē prognátus | fórtis vír sapiénsque. In both the first syllable of one tripody was treated as an anacrusis so as to produce a trochaic in place of an iambic rhythm; but this was done in the first half of the Saturnian, and the second half of the hexameter. The correspondence is seen very clearly if we invert the two halves of the former:

Fórtis vír sapiénsque | Gnaivód patrē prognátus

εἴπερ γάρ κ' ἐθέλομεν | Ἀχαιοί τε Τρῳεῖς τε.

The essential difference lies in the fact that the Greek metre acquired the dactyl in place of the trochee. This was the vital improvement. It not only gave greater flexibility to the metre, but led to the perfect fusion of the two separate tripodies. By shortening the last syllable of the first and the first syllable of the last, a continuous rhythm was gained, the dactyl thus obtained giving a 'weak caesura.' In the Saturnian verse two short syllables occasionally take the place of one, but the metre is not dactylic like the Greek. If this analysis is true, it may furnish an additional argument for the

Aeolian, and against the Ionian, origin of the Homeric poetry. It may be assumed that the artistic metres of the Aeolian poets grew out of simpler elements; and the Sapphic and Alcaic metres are remarkably analogous to the original elements of the hexameter as explained above. The Sapphic metre is a sequence of trochees, one of which is expanded by the addition of a short syllable at the division of the line. The Alcaic metre is founded likewise on a succession of dactyls and trochees, introduced by a slower iambic movement. Both imply a process very similar to that by which the elements of the old trochaic metre were varied and blended so as to form the hexameter. Fick (*Ilias*, p. 549) draws a more direct argument from the fact that the *Epithalamia* of Sappho, essentially popular and characteristic in themselves, are composed in hexameters. This, he holds, is evidence that the metre was of indigenous origin, while there is no evidence that the Ionian poets ever used the metre except for Epic poetry. The evidence is all the stronger, where the fusion of the two halves is not completely carried out. Each line of the *Epithalamion* was interrupted in the middle of the refrain Ὑμήναον (Hephaestion *de poem.* 8). The trochee frequently appears, e.g. Ὑψι δὲ τὸ μέλαθρον and Γάμβρος ἔρχεται ἴσος Ἄρεϊ (Bergk's conjecture γάμβρος appears unnecessary). The incipient stage of the metre is perfectly illustrated by such lines as

*Ολβιε γάμβρε, σοὶ μὲν | δὴ γάμος, ὥς ἀρῶ
ἐκτετέλεστ', ἔχης δὲ | παρθένον, ἂν ἀρῶ (*Fr.* 99)
οὐ γὰρ ἦν ἀτέρα παῖς, ὦ γάμβρε, τοιαῦτα (*Fr.* 106).

Still more primitive is φέρεις οἶν, φέρεις αἶγα, φέρεις ἄπυ πάτερι παῖδα (*Fr.* 95).

I would suggest further that the motive for the Ionic translation of the Homeric poetry should be sought in the Ionian development of alphabetic writing. To the Ionian genius was due both the perfecting of the alphabet, and the creation of the two great branches of prose literature, philosophy and history. But it was not to prose literature that the Ionians first applied their art. The earliest philosophers adhered to poetry, and the remains of the earliest historians show how awkward were the first attempts to dispense with the assistance of metre. It was the bent of the Ionians for writing—stimulated, no doubt, by Oriental example—which enabled their dialect to assert itself in the domain of Epic poetry, and gave them the claim to naturalise that poetry. It was by this means that the Aeolic epos became

¹ Kuhn's *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*, vol. xxiv. 1879. The question is fully treated by Hermann Usener ('Altgriechischer Versbau,' Bonn, 1887), whose independent and thorough investigation has resulted in a substantially identical conclusion. He also agrees with Mr. Allen as to the original (Aryan) form of the metre.

the property of an Ionian school. By the same means the Epic poetry was elaborated and expanded in Ionian hands. The work of translation, and the consequent Ionicising of the Homeric poetry, must have been gradual. The 69th Olympiad marks nearly the close of the process. The commencement can only be inferred by *à priori* evidence. But the elaboration and expansion in question appear to coincide very nearly with the growth of alphabetic writing in Ionia, according to the dates assigned by Kirchhoff. The solitary allusion to writing (as it may almost certainly be regarded) occurs in a passage of *Iliad* vi., which Fick treats as an episode, probably composed in honour of some princely family of Ionia, who traced their ancestry to the Lycian Glaucus. The fact that Simonides, in quoting from this passage, ascribes the words to the 'man of Chios,' implies of course that the episode had long been a part of the 'Homeric' poetry. But there is nothing in the passage to indicate such antiquity as would oblige

us to refer the 'baleful signs,' with Dr. Isaac Taylor (*The Alphabet*, vol. ii. p. 119) to an early 'Asiatic' syllabary. On the contrary, there is a tone very unlike the real 'Homer' in the mournful apophthegm, which struck Simonides as the 'fairest of sayings.' He himself might have composed these lines, which I translate in the metre of the original:

The races of men are born and die as the
leaves of the forest.
As the dead leaves fall betimes in the wind,
but anon with the springtide
The greenwood is quickened again, and the
leafage appeareth in season,
So hath the seed of man its time to increase
and to perish.

The description of the long message of deadly import, which Proetus 'graved in a folded tablet,' seems to point to a time when alphabetic writing was known, but was still a novelty.

GEORGE C. WARR.

SCHMIDT'S STUDIES ON THE GREEK DRAMATISTS.

Kritische Studien zu den Griechischen Dramatikern. DR. F. W. SCHMIDT. Berlin. Weidmann, 1886. Vol. I. 8 Mk. Vol. II. 14 Mk.

IN these volumes Dr. F. W. Schmidt collects the fruits of his studies in Attic Tragedy during the last ten years. The first volume (pp. xiv. + 282) contains emendations of Aeschylus and Sophocles; the second (iv. + 511), of Euripides. The prefatory note to the second volume (dated Dec. 7, 1886), promises a third.

It is just a quarter of a century since, in his work *De ubertate orationis Sophocleae* (ii. 25), Dr. Schmidt wrote of himself, 'mihi ipsi multo potius est conservare quam destruere.' In the Preface to his new work, he describes himself as being, indeed, 'a nature of thoroughly conservative bent'; but years have changed his point of view. He began with an earnest desire to defend the manuscript tradition against rash innovation. He has come to feel that there is a still higher duty—namely, to vindicate the genius of the ancient masters from the blunders of transcribers. He holds, with his friend Nauck, that 'we must ascribe to Sophocles, under all circumstances, the most beautiful work, the most complete, that we can conceive';

and further, that the extant plays suffice to give us a standard by which we can separate the spurious from the genuine 'with tolerable certainty.' The result to which, in practice, this doctrine leads is exaggerated distrust of the tradition. The subjective test is as arbitrary as it is rigorous. Spuriousness is at once assumed if anything, in language or in matter, does not square with the critic's notions. The niceties of Greek idiom are not observed with sufficient care, or with that sympathetic allowance for possible modifications of them which is to language what the scientific imagination is to science; the poetical context is seldom studied with sufficient closeness; the spirit of prose—and sometimes of tame prose—is apt to be dominant. I have elsewhere noticed a palmary instance, — Nauck's rejection of *O. C.* 610f.

The present volumes abound with examples. The reasons assigned for pronouncing a passage corrupt repeatedly surprise us by their manifest inadequacy. All the diligence is reserved for the task of emendation. It can hardly be doubted that this school of criticism must at last engender a defensive reaction, of which, indeed, there are already signs among the best German scholars of the new generation.

Meanwhile, it is only just to recognise the learning, the industry, the frequent acuteness, the uniform candour and modesty of Dr. Schmidt's work. Even those who believe that few of his emendations ought to find their way into the texts can read his studies with interest and profit. For emendations are not necessarily useless when they are not right. They may have a suggestive value; they can try, and strengthen, our comprehension of the original text.

In the first place we may notice some passages where Dr. Schmidt's conjectures, if not convincing, are at least attractive. In Eur. *Phoen.* 1651 ff., Antigone protests against Creon's refusal of sepulture to Polynices:—

1651. AN. οὐκ ἔντομον γὰρ τὴν δίκην πρᾶσσεσθέ νιν.

KP. εἴπερ γε πόλεως ἐχθρὸς ἦν, οὐκ ἐχθρὸς ὦν.

1653. AN. οὐκὼν ἔδωκε τῇ τύχῃ τὸν δαίμονα;

KP. καὶ τῷ τάφῳ νῦν τὴν δίκην παρασχέτω.

The scholiast took v. 1653 to mean, 'Did he not, then, pay the doom (death) to his fortune?'—an impossible version. Nor will ἔδωκεν ἡ τύχη serve. Schmidt (vol. ii. p. 429) proposes οὐκὼν ὅδ' εἶκε τῇ τύχῃ τῶν δαιμόνων; 'Was he not constrained, then, by the heaven-sent fate?' Cp. Aesch. *Ag.* 1071, εἶκονσ' ἀνάγκη. I incline to believe that this is a true correction. Schmidt quotes Eur. *I. T.* 867, δαίμονος τύχα τινός (where Herwerden needlessly proposes τέχνη): but he might more aptly have quoted Eur. fr. 37, τὰς δὲ δαιμόνων τύχας. In v. 1651 he would change ἐχθρὸς ὦν to ἐχθρὰ ὁρῶν, and takes the sense to be: 'Yes, (my decision is *unjust*), if he was a foe of the city without doing a foeman's deeds,'—i.e. a harmless foe. But ἐχθρὸς ὦν is clearly sound. Creon means: 'Yes, (my decision is just,) seeing that he was the city's foe, though no foe (by birth),'—but a natural φίλος.—In Eur. *Andr.* 468, sons born to the same man by different women (ἀμφιμάτορες κόροι) are said to be ἐριδας οἴκων ἀντιστροφῆς τε λύπας. Instead of ἐριδας we want ~~, as the antistrophe shows. Schmidt (ii. 38) proposes οἴκων ἐρινῆς. This is ingenious, but the word is too strong; the notion required is merely, 'cause of dissension.' ἐρίσμιτ' (or ἐρισμὰ τ' οἴκων lies nearer (the sing. ἐρισμα occurs in *Il.* 4. 37), and ἐριδας may well have been a gloss on it. This correction was suggested by Hermann, and had occurred to me independently.—In *Andr.* 746 ἀδύνατος οὐδὲν ἄλλο πλὴν λέγειν μόνον, Schmidt's ἐρδαυ (ii. 44) is taking, at first sight: but, just as we have

ἀδύνατα (= οὐ δυνατὰ) μὴ οὐ βλάπτειν, so it is conceivable that οὐδέν might stand here; and in any case οὐ δυνατός (Rappold) is a gentler remedy.

In Aesch. *P.* V. 1031, ἀλλὰ καὶ λίαν εἰρημένος is opposed to πεπλασμένος (said of the threat, κόμπος, brought from Zeus by Hermes), and ought to mean, 'but denounced in all earnest.' Schmidt (i. 2) cleverly proposes ἀλλ' ἐκ καρδίας εἰρημένος. The participle has certainly never been corrected with success (for εἰμαρμένος will not serve). The true question, however, is not whether καὶ λίαν alone, could mean, 'in good earnest,' but whether, in combination with εἰρημένος, it could have that sense. εἰρημαι is often used of solemn decision or command (cp. ῥήτρα), and a doom, which is καὶ λίαν εἰρημένος, might (I think) be contrasted with one uttered merely in jest, or so as to scare without hurting. In *O. T.* 579, ἄρχεις δ' ἐκέύῃ ταῦτα γῆς ἴσον νέμων ('and thou rulest the land as she doth, with equal sway'), Schmidt is again ingenious in proposing (i. 164) ἀρχῆς δ' ἐκέύῃ ταῦτ' ἔχεις ἴσον νέμων, 'and thou hast all this' (power in Thebes), 'having an equal share of sway with her.' But ταῦτ' ἔχεις (to say nothing of palaeographical probability) is odd; while the only plausible objection to the vulgate, viz. the absolute use of νέμων as = 'ruling,' is very easily met: cp. Pind. *P.* 3, 70, ὃς Συρακόσσαισι νέμει βασιλεύς, 'who rules at Syracuse,'—where, as here, the special sense of νέμω is suggested by the context. In *O. T.* 1031 τί δ' ἄλγος ἴσχοιτ' ἐν κακοῖς με λαμβάνεις, Schmidt would read (i. 173) τί δ' ἰσχάτοις ὄντ' ἐν κακοῖς με λαμβάνεις;—supposing that from the last five letters of ἰσχάτοις came ἄλγος, and from the first three the ἴσχ of ἴσχοιτ': but, though ἴσχ' ἄλγος might have thus arisen, it is not likely that the first corrupted syllable should have jumped over the two next. In *O. C.* 1076 Schmidt seems not insensible to the merit of Bücheler's ἀντάσσειν for the hopeless ἀν δάσσειν, but proposes ἀν λείσσειν (i. 196). Now, if we had to do with the infin. verb only, ἀν λείσσειν would be slightly nearer to the letters than ἀντάσσειν: but in the next verse L has τὰν δαυὰ πλάσσειν δαυὰ δ' ἐρούσσειν, which ἀντάσσειν suffers us to keep, with only the change of accent (from acc. sing. to gen. plur.); whereas Schmidt is forced by his λείσσειν to write τὼ δαυὰ πλάσσειν δαυὰ δ' ἐρούσσειν. This case is a good illustration of a general rule. Palaeographical probability, in regard to a single word, is relative to the context; i.e. the best restoration is not necessarily that which is closest to the letters of the single word, if (as compared with an alternative slightly

inferior in that respect) it involves a greater disturbance of neighbouring words.

In *O. C.* 1336 Schmidt's οἰχοῦμεν for οἰκοῦμεν (i. 200) is neat, but not right. First, οἰχοῦμεν is not ἀλώμεθα, 'wander in exile.' Secondly, οἰκοῦμεν is perfectly suitable. Oedipus has found a new home with his protector Theseus; Polyneices, with his father-in-law, Adrastus.—*Ant.* 390 σχολῇ ποθ' ἤξειν δεῦρ' ἂν ἐξήρχουν ἐγώ. Schmidt proposes δεῦρ', ἀναξ, ἡῤ'χουν (i. 183). This, if somewhat obvious, is elegant; but the text is faultless. Few verses have been more tortured, on the assumption that ἂν could not go with ἐξήρχουν. But cp. Eur. *Helen.* 1619, οὐκ ἂν ποτ' ἡῤ'χουν οὔτε σ' οὔθ' ἡμᾶς λαθεῖν | Μενέλαον, ὧναξ, ὥς ἐλάνθανεν παρών: 'I should never have said,'—where, just as here, the suppressed protasis is, 'if I had been asked.' Lys. or. 12 § 22, ἐγὼ δ' ἐβουλόμην ἂν αὐτοὺς ἀληθῆ λέγειν, 'I could wish': sc. εἰ δυνατόν ἦν. The difficulties made about the ἂν in this verse (*Ant.* 390) seem to spring from a confused notion that, because the φύλαξ had actually said (in an 'aside,' 329) that he did not mean to come back, he was therefore debarred from using such a turn of phrase as, 'I could have vowed that I should not soon be here again.'

An immense number of the emendations in these volumes concern passages which do not afford a shadow of real ground for surmising any fault in the text. A few samples of this very large class may be given. Aesch. *Theb.* 244, τούτῳ γὰρ Ἄρης βόσκεται, φόνῳ βροτῶν. Eteocles has just said, 'If ye hear of men dying or wounded, be not swift to cry aloud; for this is Ares' food, even the blood of men.' It might have been thought that, in such a context, τούτῳ was secure against suspicion. Yet Weil would change it to κοινῷ, while others have proposed χλωρῷ or ῥυτῷ. Schmidt (i. 5) prefers, 'as surer,' θούρος.—*Ag.* 418, ὁμμάτων δ' ἐν ἀχρνίαις: Schmidt (i. 34), δωμάτων δ' ἐν ἐρημίαις.—*Cho.* 845f. ἢ πρὸς γυναικῶν δειματούμενοι λόγοι | πεδάρσιοι θρώσκουσι, θνήσκοντες μάτην. Schmidt (i. 82) alters θνήσκοντες to φάσκοντες. *O. T.* 719, ἔρριψεν ἄλλων χερσίν: Schmidt (i. 170) ἔρριψ' ὁπαδῶν χερσίν.—*Ib.* 792 δηλώσοιμ': Schmidt (i. 171) γεννήσοιμ'.—*O. C.* 907, νῦν δ' οὔσπερ αὐτὸς τοὺς νόμους εἰσῆλθ' ἔχων. Admitting that the article is confirmed by *Ant.* 404, θάπτουσιν ὃν σὺ τὸν νεκρὸν | ἀπείπας, Schmidt objects to εἰσῆλθε in reference to entering the land (but why?); and proposes (i. 195) νῦν δ' οὔσπερ αὐτὸς θείει νόμους εἰσῆλθε γῆν.—*Ant.* 517, οὐ γάρ τι δοῦλος ἀλλ' ἀδελφὸς ὦλετο. Schmidt, for τι δοῦλος, would read τριδούλος (i. 184).—Eur. *Andr.* 462f., εἰ δ' ἐγὼ

πράσσω κακῶς, | μηδὲν τόδ' αὔχει καὶ σὺ γὰρ πράξειας ἂν. For πράξειας, πταίσειας (ii. 37).—*Hec.* 1226f., ἐν τοῖς κακοῖς γὰρ ἀγαθοὶ σαφέστατοι | φίλοι. Nothing could seem less provocative of change. But Schmidt would read ἐν τοῖς κακοῖς γὰρ ἂν μάθοις σαφέστατα | φίλους (ii. 99).—Eur. fr. 94, αἰεὶ δ' ἀρέσκειν τοῖς κρατοῦσι ταῦτα γὰρ | δούλοις ἄριστα. Both αἰεὶ, and the infin. as a 'sententious' imperat., suit the γνώμη: yet Schmidt would alter αἰεὶ into μέλον (ii. 440). All this is not amending, but wanton re-writing. Yet there is hardly a page of either volume which does not furnish such instances.

In his Preface the author expresses a laudable distaste for conjectures which ignore palaeographical probability (p. ix). And he is frequently careful to indicate the process by which he conceives the corruption to have arisen. But, on the other hand, there are numerous instances in which this principle is either strained or disregarded. Thus in *O. T.* 420ff., βοῆς δὲ τῆς σῆς ποῖος οὐκ ἔσται λιμήν, Schmidt is tempted to read βοῆς δὲ σῆς τίς οὐκ ἀκούσεται μέλη, but rejects this elegant verse in favour of βοῆς δὲ τῆς σῆς ποῦ ποτ' οὐκ ἔσται μέλη: and then proceeds to change σύμφωνος τάχα (421) into σύμφωνος γόοις, and δόμοις (422) into πάλαι,—assuming (a) that πάλαι (uncial) generated τάχα, and γόοις, δόμοις: and (b) that the corrupted words then changed places (i. 161).—In *O. T.* 1512, εὔχεσθέ μοι becomes εὖχος φανῶ (i. 181).—In *O. C.* 1083, where θεωρήσασα τοῦμὸν ὄμμα is corrupt, θεωρήσας φίλον θέαμα is proposed (i. 196). Now, it is true that OMMA and OEAMA might without much difficulty be confused; but it is a harder saying that 'in τΟΥΜΟΝ' (sic) 'tritt ΦΙΑΟΝ nicht minder deutlich zu Tage' (i. 196).—In *O. C.* 1116, ταῖς τηλικαῖσδε σμικρὸς ἐξαρκεῖ λόγος, the first two words are changed to ταῖσδ' ἐν τύχαις γε, because it is unworthy of Sophocles to glance—as he seems to do here—at other poets who had given long speeches to young maidens (i. 198); but Schmidt has forgotten that in Soph. *El.* 1289 there is another instance of such covert criticism.—In Eur. *Bacch.* 209, δι' ἀριθμῶν οὐδὲν is changed to ἀπωθῶν δ' οὐδέν, which suits the sense, but is not palaeographically justified by the suggestion that ΔΙ may have been a dittographia of ΑΠ (ii. 55). Brady's διαρῶν (received by Tyrrell) is still the best correction.—Eur. *Her.* 169, ἐρεῖς τὸ λῶστον ἐλπίδ' εὐρήσειν μόνον. The Argive Copreus is dissuading Demophon from sheltering the children of Heracles. The sense is, 'At best, you will gain only a hope,' viz., of the strength which the young Heracleidae will

bring to Athens when they come to manhood. I incline to think that we should read:—*έρῳ τὸ λῶστον ἐλπιδ' εὐρήσει μόνον*. Schmidt's treatment of this verse is remarkable. In ΕΛΠΙΔ he finds ΧΑΡΙΝ: in ΕΥΦΗΣΕΙΝ, ΕΚΤΙΣΕΙΝ: in ΜΟΝΟΝ, ΣΤΟΛΟΝ: in ΤΟΛΩΙ, ΠΟΛΕΙ: in ΣΤΟΝ, ΠΟΤΕ: and so evolves a verse which has not a word, except the first, in common with the text; viz. *έρεις πόλει ποτὲ χάριν ἐκτίσειν στόλον*. (ii. 170). He anticipates the criticism that, in a textual sense, he has 'not left one stone standing on another'; but expects an admission that 'in detail the changes are not improbable, and the restored sense leaves nothing to be desired.'

We know on good authority—that of Dionysus himself—that the equanimity of Sophocles in the shades was what it had been on earth; but verily there are some things here that might try it a little, if there is any consciousness of emendations in the house of Hades. Consider, for example, *O.T.* 1084: *τοιόσδε δ' ἐκφὺς οὐκ ἂν ἐξέλθοιμ' ἔτι | ποτ' ἄλλος, ὥστε μὴ 'κμαθεῖν τοῦμὸν γένος*. Under Dr. Schmidt's treatment, this comes out as follows:—*τοιόσδε δ' ἐκφὺς οὐκ ἂν ἐξέλθοιμί τις | ἄνθρωπος, οὗ 'στι μὴ ἐκμαθεῖν λῶν γένος*: 'a person whose birth it is better not to find out' (i. 176). In *O.T.* 374, *μῖα τρέφει πρὸς νυκτός*, becomes *διαστρέφει πρὸς νυκτός*, 'you are led astray by Night' (i. 158). In *O.T.* 284f., *ἄνακτ' ἄνακτι ταῦθ' ὀρώντ' ἐπίσταμαι | μάλιστα Φοῖβω Τειρεσίαν* emerges as *ἄνακτι Φοῖβω ταῦθ' ὀρώντ' ἐπίσταμαι | μάλιστα φωρᾶν Τειρεσίαν* ('is most likely to detect the culprit,' i. 155). We have no room for more examples; but the few which have been cited are only average specimens of a large class.

Lastly, we notice in these volumes an occasional tendency to re-open textual questions long ago settled (in the general opinion) by corrections so simple and so convincing

as to appear final. Among the corrections of this rare order we cannot hesitate to number Valckenär's in Eur. *Hipp.* 441f., *οὐ τᾶρα γ' οὐ δέῃ τοῖς ἐρώσι τῶν πέλας | ὅσοι τε μέλλουσ', εἰ θανεῖν αὐτοὺς χρεών*. The Nurse is saying to Phaedra, 'Thou lovest; what wonder? So do many. And then art thou to die for love? Truly 'tis hard for those who love,—and yet shall love,—if they must die.' The corruption is in *οὐ δέῃ*. The scholiast gives, *οὐ λυσίτελεῖ*. On this hint Valckenär restored *οὐ τᾶρα λύει*. (Cp. *Alc.* 627, *φημὶ τοιοῦτους γάμους | λύνει βροτοῖς*.) The phrase perfectly suits the Nurse's tone. Schmidt objects to this most certain correction that the words *ὅσοι τε μέλλουσ'* remain obscure; as if the common ellipse of the infin. (*ἐρᾶν*) was a difficulty: cp. Thuc. 3, 55, *οὔτε ἐπάθετε οὔτε ἐμελλήσατε*: Soph. *Tr.* 75, *ἐπιστρατεύειν . . . ἢ μέλλειν ἔτι*. He then re-writes thus: *οὐ τᾶρα πότμον τοῖς ἐρώσιν εὐτυχῇ | θεοὶ νέμουσιν, εἰ θανεῖν αὐτοὺς χρεών* (ii. 234). In Eur. *Suppl.* 745, *οἱ τόξον ἐκτείνοντες τοῦ καιροῦ πέρα*, the simple correction of *τοῦ* to *ὡς* (exclamatory) seems nearly certain. *ὡς* had dropped out: a scribe ignorant of metre supplied *τοῦ*. Schmidt writes *καὶ τόξον ἐκτείνοντες οὐ καιρῷ, τὸ πᾶν*, and places the verse between 740 and 741 (with *ἔπειτ'* for *καῖπειτ'* in the latter).

Tested by the number of real corruptions which find probable corrections, these studies yield but a small result. Viewed, on the other hand, as exercises of ingenuity on given texts, they are often interesting; most often so, perhaps, when they challenge us to show that the impugned text can be vindicated by a just interpretation. 'Sarcinas colligam antequam proficiscar e vita,' is Dr. Schmidt's motto; but all scholars will hope that the melancholy ring of Varro's words is fraught with no omen.

R. C. JEBB.

BLAYDES' ARISTOPHANES.

Aristophanis Comici quae supersunt opera: recensuit F. H. M. BLAYDES. Halis Sax-onum, 1886. 2 vols. 16 Mk.

MR. BLAYDES has chosen a very attractive form for his recension of the text of Aristophanes. No other edition—not even Meineke's *Prachtausgabe*—can compare with it in external beauty. And though we may hesitate to admit that none of the

other editions is 'ab omnibus partibus absoluta et literatorum usui accommodata,' we may gladly allow that Mr. Blaydes' is better fitted than any other to be the Library and indeed the Standard edition of the Comedian.

How much Mr. Blaydes had done for Aristophanes more than forty years ago can be seen by any one who studies the critical notes of Meineke or A. Müller on the *Acharnians*; and his later editions have all

exhibited the fruits of riper scholarship and intensified application. And although we cannot expect to find in his notes final solutions of all difficult passages; yet we may count on finding the best material exhaustively collected, and well-considered suggestions modestly delivered. What we should most expect from a scholar whose ear must be so *subacta lectione Aristophanis* would be observations of slight errors and difficulties which had escaped hastier readers; and this expectation is abundantly realized, as will be shown by the following list of corrections (in the *Vespae* and *Lysistrata* only), most of which future editors will probably adopt without hesitation.

Vespae.

- 540 οὐκέθ' ὁ πρεσβυτῶν ὄχλος *for* οὐκέτι πρ.
 577 ἄχων φάσκεϊς *for* ἄχεις φάσκων.
 599 εἶτα Θέωρος *for* ἀλλὰ Θέωρος.
 640 εὐθὺς ἔδοξα *for* αὐτὸς ἔδοξα.
 676 ὕρχας οἴνου *for* ὕρχας, οἶνον.
 748 σωφρονεῖν μέλλει *for* σωφρονεῖ μέντοι.
 849 οἶμοι τί διατρίβεις; ἀπολεῖς *for* οἶμοι διατρίβεις κάπολεῖς.
 906 τῇσδ' ἐγχεάμενος *for* τήνδ' ἐγχεάμενος.
 999 δῆτ' ἐγὼ *for* τοῦτ' ἐγώ.
 1110 πυκνοί *for* πυκνόν.
 1230 κακ' τῇσδε *for* καὶ τῇσδε.
 1291 ἐξηπάτηκεν *for* ἐξηπάτησεν.
 1528 γαστρίσας σεαυτὸν *for* γάστρισον σεαυτόν.

Lysistrata.

- 42 τί δ' ἂν αἱ γυναῖκες *for* τί δ' ἂν γυναῖκες.
 71 περὶ τοσούτου πράγματος *for* περὶ τοιούτου π.
 83 ὥς δ' αὖ καλόν *for* ὥς δὴ καλόν.
 143 ἄνις *for* ἄνευ.
 183 ὁμοούμεθα *for* ὁμίομεθα.
 191 οὔρκος *for* ὄρκος.
 271 ἐμοὶ ζῶντί γ' ἐγχανοῦνται *for* ἐμοῦ ζῶντος.
 287 λοιπὸν ἔτι τὸ χωρίον *for* λοιπὸν ἔστι χ.
 297 προσπεσὼν μοῦκ τῆς χύτρας *for* προσπεσὼν μ' ἐκ τ. χ.
 633 ἐξῆς Ἀριστογείτονος *for* ἑ. Ἀριστογείτονι.
 634 ταῦτό γάρ μοι *for* αὐτό γάρ μοι.
 654 ἐξαναλώσαντες *for* εἶτ' ἀναλώσαντες.
 662 ὥς τιν' ἄνδρα δεῖ *for* ὥς τὸν ἄνδρα δεῖ.
 763, 4 οὐ ποθεῖν | οἶσθ' *for* οὐκ οἶε | ποθεῖν.
 1266 ἔμπεδος *for* εὐπορος.

More ambitious alterations in the *Vespae* are 105 τῇ κυκλίδι *for* τῷ κίονι, 291 ἐθελήσει δίδόν' οἶν *for* τί μοι οἶν, 318 διὰ τῆς κάπνης *for* διὰ τῆς ὀπῆς, 536 οὗτός σε λέγων κρατήσει *for* οὗτός σ' ἐθέλει κρατῆσαι, 873 γραφῶν *for* πλάων, 1020 διδάσκων *for* χέασθαι, 1286 κάπεσι κακοῖς ἐκῦκα *for* καί με κακίαις ἔκνισε,

1525 ἵνα ῥίπτοντος ἄνω *for* ὅπως ἰδόντες ἄνω in most of which we may suspect Mr. Blaydes to be right, but certainty is, from the nature of the case, out of the question.

If this analysis were extended to the rest of the eleven plays it would appear that Mr. Blaydes' merits in Aristophanes may compare favourably with those of the most eminent Atticists; yet naturally the editor of so well-known an author has besides original work to appraise that of his predecessors; and of Mr. Blaydes' judgment the new edition will give a more favourable view than the critical commentary in the old. The faults which the editor, after the fashion of Cratinus, constantly finds with himself, of disorderliness and want of proportion, are trifling but very real ones, and make his conclusions which ordinarily seem to be right, stand in a strange relation to his premises. On *Lys.* 726 προφάσεις—ἐλκουσιν we read: ἐλκουσιν *libri et vulg.* πλέκουσιν *Wakefield ad Eur. Ion.* 1430... πλέκουσιν *et ipse conieceram, nam locutio προφάσεις ἔλκειν plane inaudita est.* Then follow seven examples of the phrase πλέκειν μηχανάς (*sic*); a conjecture παρέχουσιν with one example, a third conjecture πλάττουσιν with six examples, one of them illustrating the phrase πλάττειν προφάσεις; and at the end *his scriptis video recte se habere vulgatam; cf. Herod. vi. 86.* The reader will have unquestionably learned not a little from this note, although, unless he be of a very equable temper, his respect for the author of it will not have been increased, but the conclusion is in all probability correct, and this is all that appears in the new edition. This advantage appears in cases where the result is more positive. Mr. Blaydes has thus the honour of being the first editor to print in *Vespae* 651 Reiske's conjecture ἐντετακυῖαν (*for* ἐντετοκυῖαν); it would seem a very brilliant restoration, as adding one to the list of perfect participles with graduating stems collected by de Saussure *Mémoire*, etc. p. 155, and G. Meyer *Gr. Gr.* § 46, and substituting for a solecism the very word which the passage requires; see Blaydes' notes on *Soph. El.* 1311 and *Lys.* 553. (Surely for this and σε μόνον in *Vespae* 588 Reiske deserved a place 'inter eos qui in nostro emendando felicissime operam navarunt, *Praef.* p. xv.). In obeying the canons of Elmsley and Cobet Mr. Blaydes exhibits the sound sense which we should expect from his long experience and careful investigations. He is equally justified in writing ἐπεπόνθη in *Eccl.* 650 (against Bergk), and in rejecting the dictate of

the Atticist in *Vespae* 394. If any fault of general principle or the want of it can be found, it perhaps lies in his treatment of questions of orthography and dialect. *μῆϊξαι*, etc. is the only spelling allowed by Meisterhans, p. 25; Mr. Blaydes however does not introduce this innovation in *Lys.* 581, etc., nor can it be demanded; but then he surprises us with the alterations *σάγοντας* *Lys.* 1256 for *θάγοντας*, *συρσαδδωάν* 1313 for *θυρσαδδωάν*, which seem strangely bold, seeing that we do not know in the least the law by which *θ* in Laconian changed into *σ*, and indeed the newest authorities throw some doubt on the antiquity of the operation; 'in unsere Ueberlieferung der *Lysistrata*,' says G. Meyer, § 211, 'ist dieser Lautwandel von späterer Redaction ohne Consequenz eingeschmuggelt worden.' Perhaps the tradition should not have been tampered with in *Lys.* 95 *μυσιδδέτω ὁ τι λῆς ποθ' ἀμέ*. It is likely to have been suggested before this that we may have here a vestige of the original use of the form in *-τω* without distinction of person, discussed by Brugmann, *M. U.* i. 163.

The long and elaborate Preface will probably win from most readers applause like that given to the speech of Agathon ὡς *πρεπόντως τοῦ πρεσβύτου εἰρηκότος αὐτῷ τε καὶ τῷ ποιητῇ*, and, we may add, to previous editors, who all receive some generous estimate. Mr. Blaydes may be well congratulated on having at last succeeded in bringing an elaborate edition of the Comedian to the end; for to Schütz, Thiersch, Fritzsche, and Enger (mentioned on p. xii.), whose editions did not proceed beyond a few plays, may be added all the commentators in

Küster's edition; Spanheim, it will be remembered, thought it would not suit his 'persona' to comment on more than three, and Küster himself, *gestiens nummum in loculos demittere*, stopped at the ninth. Yet Mr. Blaydes must have taken far more trouble than any of his predecessors; for to have collated 48 MSS. (p. xi.), 'plus minusve diligenter' represents labour only to be paralleled by Mommsen's *Pindar*. It might have been wished that Mr. Blaydes had imitated the admirable systematisation and nomenclature of Mommsen, where *A*'s and *a*'s tell us directly the class of a MS., its rank, and whether it is an independent or a secondary authority. The work however of classification Mr. Blaydes leaves to future editors (p. xiii.), contenting himself with the observation (p. x.) that the MSS. of Aristophanes notably came from two founts. No one could perform this task as well as he; as it is, his list of MSS. is unique and so renders his edition indispensable.

The collection of Fragments which fills the second volume and also forms the twelfth volume of the large edition deserves a separate notice. The list of works bearing on Aristophanes (vol. i. pp. lxxxi.—xc.) is useful, but rather incomplete. Remarkable omissions are the essays of Wilamowitz-Möllendorf; Zielinski's *Gliederung der Attischen Komödie* (perhaps this appeared too late); Müller-Strübing's *Aristophanes und die historische Kritik*, which found an admirer in one high authority on Aristophanes, von Velsen. But the indices to this Review, if adequately carried out, will in future render such lists unnecessary.

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

WELLDON'S RHETORIC OF ARISTOTLE.

The Rhetoric of Aristotle translated, with an Analysis and Critical Notes, by J. E. C. WELLDON, M.A. Macmillan & Co., 1886. 7s. 6d.

THOUGH the English student of the *Rhetoric* has already much to be thankful for in the four volumes of Cope's admirable Introduction and Commentary, it is a pleasure to welcome additional assistance in the shape of a translation by a scholar of high repute; and to those who are conscious of a debt of gratitude to the older scholar it will be a matter of satisfaction that Mr. Welldon

takes him as his guide, and in general accepts his judgment upon the many difficulties of the treatise. A translator who follows Cope thus closely is, however, exposed to a danger which Mr. Welldon has not, I believe, sufficiently appreciated. Throughout the work (for the Introduction and the Commentary are, in effect, one book) Cope has often jotted down alternative explanations, between which with characteristic diffidence he could not bring himself to pronounce. This want of decision is reflected in some passages of Mr. Welldon's translation. It appears especially in the use

of alternative renderings of technical terms.¹ It must be admitted, however, that there is some excuse for this artifice. With regard to technicalities a translator of the *Rhetoric* has a more difficult task than a translator of the *Ethics*, as we can hardly be said to have in English a rhetorical vocabulary; but for myself I am inclined to prefer in both cases the plan adopted by Dr. Jackson in his translation of the Fifth Book of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, viz. the retention of Greek technical terms in the text of the English Translation.

There is in Cope's work one real deficiency which is supplied in the book before us. A student of the *Rhetoric* ought to have constantly at hand a clear and concise tabular summary of contents, especially when he is reading those chapters which contain long and minute classifications. This want is very well met by Mr. Welldon's full and accurate analysis. Cope's so-called 'analysis' is of a different kind, being in many places an expanded paraphrase. Both these aids are needed for the study of the treatise.

Mr. Welldon has shown good judgment in sometimes, though rarely, preferring another interpretation to that of Cope. In one difficult and very important passage he is, I think, mistaken in so doing. The passage in question, I. ii. 8-9, stands thus in Bekker's text:—

πάντες δὲ τὰς πίστεις ποιοῦνται διὰ τοῦ δεικνύειν ἢ παραδείγματα λέγοντες ἢ ἐνθυμήματα, καὶ παρὰ ταῦτα οὐδέν πως ὥστ' εἶπερ καὶ ὅλως ἀνάγκη συλλογιζόμενον ἢ ἐπάγοντα δεικνύειν ὅτι οὖν (δῆλον δ' ἡμῖν τοῦτο ἐκ τῶν ἀναλυτικῶν), ἀναγκαῖον ἐκάτερον αὐτῶν ἐκατέρῳ τούτων τὸ αὐτὸ εἶναι. τίς δ' ἐστὶ διαφορὰ παραδείγματος καὶ ἐνθυμήματος, φανερόν ἐκ τῶν τοπικῶν· ἐκεῖ γὰρ περὶ συλλογισμοῦ καὶ ἐπαγωγῆς εἴρηται πρότερον, ὅτι . . . κ.τ.λ.

This is translated:—

'The universal means of demonstrative proof in *Rhetoric* are examples or enthymemes, and there is no other; hence if it is assumed to be absolutely necessary that whatever is proved should be proved either by syllogism or by induction—and this we see clearly from the *Analytics*—it is a necessary conclusion that the enthymeme

and example are respectively identical with the syllogism and induction. The difference between example and enthymeme on the one hand and induction and syllogism on the other is clear from the *Topics*. For as syllogism and induction have been already discussed, it is clear that . . .' &c. (The translator's italics denote both explanatory insertions and the titles of books).

Mr. Welldon, not seeing apparently that his interpretation is very different from that of Cope, says, in a note on the words 'is clear from the *Topics*':—'The meaning, as Mr. Cope saw, should be not so much that the difference is stated in the *Τοπικά* as that it may be inferred from the definitions of syllogism and induction given in the *Τοπικά*.' The fact is that this explanation was meant to obviate any such violent remedy as that adopted by Mr. Welldon, who (1) supposes a well-nigh impossible ellipse, (2) alters ἐκεῖ into ἐπεί, and (3) inserts φανερόν in the text. Cope's interpretation (Introduction, p. 154) makes the vulgate reading quite clear.

A reader of a translation of the *Rhetoric* 'with critical notes' has a right to look for some guidance on the vexed question of the enthymeme, the battle-ground of critics ancient, mediaeval, and modern (for the history of the controversy see Hamilton, *Discussions on Philosophy*, p. 151 *sqq.*). As there is no very precise statement on the subject in the *Rhetoric*, it is disappointing to find nothing more than the following note: 'The λογικὸς συλλογισμὸς, which is complete in all its parts, is here opposed to the ἐνθύμημα, which is an imperfect or rhetorical syllogism' (p. 6). The alternative opinion deserves at least a mention. As it is, we know no more than that Mr. Welldon follows Cope's later view. For Cope himself hesitated, adopting in the text of the Introduction (p. 103) the opinion of Hamilton, only to abandon it in a foot-note on the same page, where he writes: 'the view given in the text was adopted mainly in deference to the decided opinion expressed by Sir W. Hamilton.' Lower down we seem to find a hint that this change of view was adopted mainly in deference to the decided opinion expressed by Mill on Hamilton's philosophy in general. However this may be, Cope's mature judgment on the subject is clearly expressed in his Commentary (vol. ii. p. 221): 'The difference between the two is simply this, that the dialectician rigorously maintains the form of the syllogism, with its three propositions . . .; the rhetorician never expresses all three.' As Mr. Welldon has placed the

¹ I do not mean that Mr. Welldon borrows Cope's words, but that he adopts his principle. The awkwardness of this method may be clearly seen on p. 285, where σύμβολα is translated 'signs or probabilities,' while on p. 17 'signs' and 'probabilities' are contrasted, representing σημεία and εἰκότα respectively.

weight of his authority on the same side, I venture to bring together a few of Aristotle's own statements on the subject, in order to show that, in his view, the enthymeme is simply a syllogism of a peculiar subject-matter, and that, though practically the enthymeme is generally imperfect in form (*i.e.* merely *sententia cum ratione*, as Quintilian says), yet a rhetorical argument expressed in full syllogistic form is still an enthymeme; *i.e.* a deduction ἐξ εἰκότων ἢ σημείων, whether expressed in full syllogistic form or not, is always an enthymeme.

(1) *Anal. Pr.* ii. 27, ἐνθύμημα μὲν οὖν ἐστὶ συλλογισμὸς ἐξ εἰκότων ἢ σημείων. Note that this is a definition, and that nothing is said as to the incomplete character of the enthymeme. The difference is a difference of matter. Apparently in the early stage of the controversy the unwarrantable insertion of ἀτελής in this passage was a great support to the view now taken by Mr. Welldon, as well as the absurd idea that ἐνθύμημα meant 'something kept back ἐν θυμῷ,' *i.e.* the suppression of a premiss.

(2) *Rhet.* I. ii. 13, ἐξ ὀλίγων καὶ πολλάκις ἐλαττόνων ἢ ἐξ ὧν ὁ πρῶτος συλλογισμὸς. Cope (Introduction, p. 157) says: 'The enthymeme is deduced from few premisses and often (*always*, I believe...) consists of fewer propositions.' Still there is no doubt that Aristotle wrote πολλάκις, which word, as Cope himself dimly perceived, was fatal to his position. Mr. Welldon translates: 'with its constituent parts only few and generally fewer than those of the primary or normal syllogism.' The translation of ὁ πρῶτος συλλογισμὸς is correct; but the phrase 'syllogism of the first figure' in his note is, I think, wrong, since it is a difference of form which is here spoken of.

(3) In *Rhet.* II. xxi. 6 a γνώμη with a reason appended (*i.e.* virtually a syllogism with one premiss suppressed) is called ἐνθυμήματος μέρος; which clearly proves that, in Aristotle's opinion, an enthymeme might have a major premiss, a minor premiss, and a conclusion all expressed. Cope tries to evade this by what seems a very forced interpretation. Mr. Welldon cannot, I conceive, reconcile his own perfectly correct version of this passage with his note on page 6 quoted above.

(4) In *Rhet.* I. i. 11 Aristotle is speaking of the difference between 'logical' (*i.e.* demonstrative) syllogisms and enthymemes. I quote part of the passage from the translation: 'For as it is the same faculty which discerns what is true and what resembles truth, and as men have a sufficient natural

aptitude for truth and in a majority of instances attain it, it follows that the most sagacious judge of truth will be at the same time the most sagacious judge of probabilities.' It is unlucky that Mr. Welldon's single critical note about the enthymeme should be appended to this passage, where the difference between syllogism and enthymeme is looked at as one of matter and not of formal expression.

I add a few notes on points which have struck me in reading the translation. I. v. 3 εὐθηνία κτημάτων καὶ σωμάτων is rendered 'an abundance of goods and slaves.' εὐθηνία I take to mean 'good condition' (cf. εὐθηνεῖν τοῖς σώμασι, *gen. anim.* IV. vi. 14 and other passages given in Bonitz, *Index*) and σωμάτων 'bodies' generally. This harmonizes well with the context, cf. τὰς τοῦ σώματος ἀρετάς, § 4.

I. vii. 16 is translated 'Virtue is greater than non-virtue, vice than non-vice; for virtue and vice are, and the others are not, ends or complete states.' It seems better to take τέλη in its ordinary sense, *i.e.* 'ends to aim at.' Page 57 of the translation (note): the reading τῷ δοκεῖν should be referred to its author, Munro. Similar omissions are made in other places. Page 148, παρασκευαστέον (II. vii. 4) is taken as 'to work upon the feelings of your audience.' This is possible; but I prefer the natural translation 'we must provide materials.'

Page 222: 'If, however, there is no doubt about the fact or about its being a demonstration, the case is one which does not admit of refutation, as here each step is demonstratively proved.' The Greek is εἰ δὲ φανερόν καὶ ὅτι ὑπάρχει καὶ ὅτι τεκμήριον, ἄλυστον ἤδη γίνεται τοῦτο· πάντα γὰρ γίνεται ἀποδείξει ἤδη φανερά (II. xxvi. 14). This passage shows that Mr. Welldon's constant rendering of τεκμήριον by 'demonstration' is open to objection; for (1) 'demonstration' is wanted for ἀπόδειξις, which unfortunately occurs in this passage, (2) 'demonstration' is a process, while a τεκμήριον is a fact, (3) the significance of the term τεκμήριον, 'a conclusive sign,' is lost; *e.g.* τέτοκεν ὅτι γάλα ἔχει, 'milk is a sign of conception.' I. ii. 18.

Page 235: 'the use of diminutives' is a narrowing down of ὑποκορισμός. Page 255: by way of apology for 'parisosis,' which appears in the translation, we have this note: 'It is, I fear, impossible to help importing Aristotle's own terms into English.' I only wish Mr. Welldon had done so more often. Page 276: 'digression (ἀποπλάιησις) and ramification (ὄζοι).' The

putting of Greek terms in brackets, as here, is helpful, and might have been carried out all through the book.

This notice must be concluded with the often expressed apology of the critic that his space has been taken up in finding fault. Holding that technicalities are of real importance in a book which, after all, will be more interesting to classical students than to the 'modern world' for whom (Preface,

p. vii.) it is in part designed, I have thought it worth while to point out certain defects in the treatment of the technical groundwork of the subject. But it contains abundant evidence of the literary power and accurate scholarship for which the translator is well known; and I should be sorry to leave an impression that the book is not workmanlike, readable, and useful.

G. M. EDWARDS.

TWO BOOKS ON PAUSANIAS.

Pausanias' Description of Greece, translated into English, with Notes and Index, by ARTHUR RICHARD SHILLETO. Two Vols. George Bell and Sons. 1886. 10s.

Pausanias der Perieget; Untersuchungen über seine Schriftstellerei und seine Quellen, von DR. A. KALKMANN. Berlin, Reimer. 1886. 8 Mk.

A COMPLETE edition of Pausanias is one of the greatest *desiderata* of modern classical scholarship. The importance which is attached at the present day to epigraphy, as one of the most trustworthy sources of our knowledge of the life of the ancients, and the rapidly increasing study of archaeology and classic art, together with the kindred subjects of mythology and legendary history, tend more and more to increase the estimation in which his *Description of Greece* is held. But the time for such an edition has not yet come. The facilities which now exist for travelling and exploring in Greek lands are of comparatively recent date, so that the work of investigation is still in its infancy, while at the same time the numerous foreign Schools which have been established at Athens give promise of a rapid increase in our knowledge of what still lies concealed. A summary of the results of the researches that are being made, such as a commentary on Pausanias would involve, would be premature, until they are much further advanced than at present. It is also evident that, when that period arrives, the editor must be a many-sided man, for in addition to the wide fields of study already mentioned, he would need to possess a thorough acquaintance with Greek geography. Meanwhile, we hail with satisfaction every addition that is made to our knowledge of the author and his work, especially when it is as thoroughly scientific as the *Numismatic Commentary on Pausanias*, which is being

published by Mr. Imhoof-Blumer and Professor Percy Gardner in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*.

The first of the two books now before us is Mr. Shilleto's translation of Pausanias. Such a work, if well executed, would be of value, for, notwithstanding that the Greek of Pausanias is easy, where the text is sound, yet there must be a considerable number of general readers, especially in the class of art-students, who would be glad to consult the book in their own language. This in fact is shewn by the existence of a German translation by Schubart, the editor of the most trustworthy text of the *Descriptio Graeciae*. We commenced perusing Mr. Shilleto's work without referring to the Greek, and found it agreeable reading; but, unfortunately, when we came to compare it with the original, our estimate of it was greatly altered. Out of a number of passages, which we chose almost at random for comparison, there was hardly one which did not contain several inaccuracies. We do not so much complain of the looseness of rendering, which sometimes causes the translation to approximate to a paraphrase, as of wrong construing and faults of scholarship. The following are specimens: (v. 11, § 1), ἐν μὲν δὴ τῇ δεξιᾷ [ὁ θεὸς] φέρει Νίκην ἐξ ἐλέφαντος καὶ ταύτην καὶ χρυσοῦ, ταινίαν τε ἔχουσιν καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ κεφαλῇ στέφανον, 'in his right hand he holds a Victory in ivory and gold, with a tiara and crown on his head'; μετὰλλοις τοῖς παῖσι, 'with all manner of precious stones'; τῷ δὲ ἱματίῳ ζώδιά τε καὶ τῶν ἀνθῶν τὰ κρίνα ἐστὶν ἐμπεποιημένα, 'on his robes are imitations of flowers, especially of lilies.' (x. 21, § 1), τοὺς ἐπὶ τῶν ἀγρῶν ἐγκαταληφθέντας, 'the men that were left in the fields'; παρελθεῖν ἐς τὴν ἐντὸς Θερμοπυλῶν Ἑλλάδα, 'get into Greece by Thermopylae.' Mr. Shilleto's book may still be of service to persons who wish to make themselves acquainted with

the contents of Pausanias' work, but it certainly requires to be read with caution.

Dr. Kalkmann's book, *Pausanias der Perieget*, is one from the perusal of which we rise with a distressed feeling of perplexity. It is an unsparing, and singularly able, attack on that author. In reading it we feel as if an old and valued friend, in whose respectability we had implicit confidence, whatever we might think of his talents and judgment, had been placed in the dock, and were being charged with serious misdemeanours, involving a total loss of character, on evidence which we had no power of refuting. In Dr. Kalkmann's eyes Pausanias is an impostor to be exposed, a hypocrite to be unmasked, a plunderer to be compelled to disgorge. Let us examine the grounds on which this conclusion rests; and in so doing our object is to give the writer's arguments their full weight, premising at the same time that he relies in no slight degree on the cumulative force of numerous details, which cannot be given in a compressed form. He begins by dwelling on the fondness of Greek writers before Pausanias' time for fictitious histories, and narratives of adventure and of portents, professedly derived from personal observation, such as those which Lucian satirises in his *Vera Historia* and elsewhere: of these he gives amusing instances, and shows how these persons unblushingly appropriated statements taken directly from older writers, and put them forward as their own. Now Pausanias, he thinks, is a child of his period, and does not differ from his contemporaries in respect of borrowing, making statements at second-hand, and professing a religious belief which he did not entertain. Hence those features, which have been regarded as making Pausanias such a peculiar personality—his *naïveté* and somewhat witless simplicity, his *δυσωδοιμία*, and his curiosity in investigation—are merely devices of art, intended to throw dust in the reader's eyes. The same is the case with his often-repeated asseverations, that he saw with his own eyes the objects he describes, and received directly from the lips of others the information which he gives. To him 'I heard' is an expression equivalent to 'they say,' and both are used of statements borrowed from ancient writers. From these again the transition is easy to introducing persons as witnesses; and so, when at the city of Elis or at Phigaleia 'an old man' is his informant, and when elsewhere he quotes 'a merchant,' 'an Egyptian,' 'a Phoenician,' &c., as his authorities, these

are, one and all, his own creations; and the local *cicerones* (ἐξηγηταί), to whom he is so fond of referring, are equally fictitious. Nor less untrue are his declarations that he was present on certain occasions, *e.g.* when excavations were being made. The point of these accusations Dr. Kalkmann sharpens by producing what appear to him crucial instances—a story that Pausanias professed to have heard from 'a man of Byzantium,' which is found in Plutarch; a description of a dolphin that he saw, which, in gratitude for having once been rescued, allowed a boy to ride upon him, whereas the same thing is told by two other ancient writers; and various other portents and curiosities, which he either himself beheld or obtained evidence of, though they are related in earlier collections of *Mirabilia*. Something, perhaps, might be said by way of extenuation with regard to the wide circulation of such tales, to their becoming attached to more than one locality, and to unconscious appropriation on the writer's part, as so often happens with the retailers of good stories; but the amount of weight that is to be given to these considerations must greatly depend on the estimate that is formed of the evidence at large.

Dr. Kalkmann then proceeds to investigate the sources from which Pausanias drew for his crude compilation of second-hand book-learning, under the separate heads of archaeology, geography, art, and mythology. This part of his work is constructive as well as destructive, and we cannot but admire the varied learning displayed in it, which has a value quite independent of the subject on hand, from the light that it throws on the knowledge of these studies possessed by the ancient world. For the three great archaeological centres—Athens, Olympia, and Delphi, he finds that Pausanias' authority was Polemon, the geographer of the second century B.C. Here again his unreality is exposed. Pausanias' account of the town of Piræus, we are told, describes it as it appeared in Polemon's time, whereas its docks and chief buildings were subsequently destroyed by Sulla, and were never restored; and he takes no notice of the works of art at Athens that were set up between that period and Hadrian's reign. Elsewhere he seems to have derived his archaeological knowledge from local compilers, such as Callippus for Orchomenus, Sosibius, the Lacedæmonian grammarian, for Sparta, the *Argolice* of Deinias (or Agias) and Dercylus for Argolis, and the *Sicyonica* of Menæchmus for Sicyon. Passages from these writers,

chiefly derived from various Scholia, which correspond to statements in Pausanias, are carefully brought together by Dr. Kalkmann, and critically examined. His chief geographical authorities seem to have been Artemidorus and Eratosthenes, used at second-hand, and various *Lexica*; but all these refer to a period long past, so that Pausanias is thought to have described places, which in his time were either wholly or for the most part ruined and deserted, as if they were still flourishing. About art Pausanias obtained much information from the published catalogues of artists, to which he himself occasionally refers; and his numerous mythological notices are attributed to an earlier compendium of mythology. Dr. Kalkmann allows that Pausanias probably travelled in some parts of Greece, an admission which he turns against him by adding that he inserted here and there recollections of his travels, with the object of giving a modern colouring to his work; but he denies him all credit as an independent observer. Our consolation for the discrediting of one whom we respected as a truthful narrator is to be this—that much of what we find in his work is due, not to the hearsay of a somewhat dull traveller of the second century A.D., but to intelligent persons of an earlier period.

Now we can conceive that it may be urged in answer to this, that Pausanias may have been independent of the literary influences of his age, and that it would be no easy task to assume the mask so completely, as to leave the impression, which he does, that there was nothing counterfeit either in his

inquiries or his religion. It may be thought unlikely that he would have dared to take his materials wholesale from Polemon, when that writer's work was well known at the time, or that he would have exposed himself to the ridicule of his contemporaries by describing Athens as it existed some centuries before. Dr. Kalkmann has taken note of Pausanias' errors, but has omitted to speak of his general accuracy, which has served to guide modern explorers, and has called forth their praises, from the time of Leake to the present day; and such exactness is not easily attainable by one who copies from others and has not carefully examined for himself. It is allowed that he was an uncritical writer, and it is probable that he did not always distinguish between what he had heard and what he had read; and it is natural that he should have studied, and perhaps have carried with him on his journeys, the works of previous inquirers; this would account for some of the correspondences which are found between him and earlier writers, but would not justify the charge of wholesale appropriation. All this may fairly be urged, and should raise a presumption in Pausanias' favour; but we cannot honestly say that Dr. Kalkmann's able book can be refuted by such *à priori* considerations. If it is to be answered at all, it must be answered in detail, and to do so will be no easy matter. We leave this to his countrymen, many of whom are pledged, from the valuable aid which they have derived from Pausanias, to see that he is justly treated.

H. F. TOZER.

WHEELER ON GREEK ACCENTUATION.

Der Griechische Nominal-Accent. Von BENJAMIN J. WHEELER. Strassburg. Trübner. 3 Mk. 80.

THIS book marks a decided advance in the treatment of Greek accentuation—a very difficult subject, on which little has been written in England. Chandler's large book deals with the written, not the spoken, accent, and not at all with the history of it—so far as that history can be traced; in the second edition (1881) Wackernagel's brilliant guess (1877) is not mentioned. It is, therefore, worth while to point out in some detail what Wheeler has tried to do, and the

relation of his work to that of his predecessors.

Wackernagel (*Kuhn Z.* 23, 457) pointed out that the regular recession of the accent in the Greek verb (λείπομαι, ἐλείπομένην, λείπωμαι, &c.)—as distinguished from the freedom in position shown in the infinitives (λείπεσθαι, λιπέσθαι), the participles (λείπων, λιπών), and, generally, in nouns—is due to the same cause as that of the Sanskrit verb. In Vedic the verb is, as a rule, unaccented in the main clause, accented in dependent clauses. This, for different reasons, may be assumed for the Indo-European. Therefore in Greek also the main verb was

originally toneless; and the accent to which we are accustomed is a new, specially Greek, accent; and this accounts for its monotonous regularity. In the nouns the traces of the original freedom of the accent, its power to be on ultimate, penultimate, or other syllable, survives. Next, the new accentuation of the verb in the main clause expelled the old accentuation which survived in the dependent verb, there being to a Greek no need apparent for any difference in this matter. No verbs remained enclitic except the presents of εἰμι, φημι; these had no form so long that it was constrained to come under the new principle of accentuation. (The peculiar exceptions εἶ and φῆς are dealt with by Wackernagel, *K.Z.* 23, 460.)

Wackernagel's theory was carried on and extended by Bloomfield (*Amer. J. P.* IV. 21). In a most noteworthy and comprehensive study of Greek accent, he maintains that the change of Indo-European accent into Greek accent was brought about by a regular law—this law being the Greek law of enclisis ('recession,' as Wheeler says, is a better term), by which 'real historical enclitics appear accented, though in a manner clearly enough a mere compensation for enclisis.' Then he thinks that the noun to a large extent followed the verb, and that the vocative—which is recessive in Greek (ἄδελφε—ἄδελφός) and enclitic (like the verb) in Vedic—is an indication of this.

Here Wheeler takes up the tale. He points out the difficulty in Bloomfield's view of a regular law limited to verbs; also that it is not clear how recession could pass from verbs to nouns. One noun can affect another: *e.g.* ἀργυροῦ can circumflex ἀργυροῦς (for ἀργήρεος), or εὔρους can make εὔρον (instead of εὔροῦ); but how can a verb affect a noun? There is no starting-point for proportional analogy.

He maintains that recession must have been caused by a law universally operative on the noun as well as the verb; that the new accentuation must have spread in the usual way, *word by word* through analogy; and that the phenomena in question are due to a secondary accent (afterwards developed in many cases into primary) falling on the syllable distant by three 'morae' from the end of the word, or word-combination.¹ This new accent did not at once supersede

the old; there was a time in which the two were contending in the word. The unaccented *φερομεθα (assumed old Greek corresponding to Indo-European) did not at once become φερόμεθα, or *Ἀγαμεμνον become Ἀγάμεμνον; neither did the old accent at once give place to the new, as in long words like *ἀνεπικλητος (original for ἀνεπίκλητος.) But the new secondary accent won in places where the last three (sometimes four) 'morae' were originally accentless; and under certain other conditions.

Five cases may be distinguished:—

I. Monosyllables and dissyllables with short final generally keep the historic Indo-European accent.

Thus βοός, having but two morae, could not take the secondary accent; βοῶν or παιδός could; but here the old accent held its own. But forms like παῖδων shew the battle, and here the new won. Still we often find variations between Greek and Sanskrit (which should in theory agree); thus, *e.g.* cakrás 'a wheel' = κύκλος. These are due commonly to variation caused by strong flexion in Indo-European. But the same variation may be seen in Greek dialect forms, where it sprang up after Greek became a separate language. Thus Attic θυμός corresponds exactly to Sanskrit dhūmās, and shews the original accent; but Lesbian has θῆμος; the difference is due to secondary accent rising through flexion; *e.g.* in Lesbian *θυμός, *θυμόν, but θύμω (for θύμο-(ι)ο where secondary accent comes in) &c.; then Lesbian levelled θῆμος, θῆμον, θύμω; but Attic kept the original θυμός, θυμόν, θυμοῦ (for *θυμό-(ι)ο). In many stems there is perfect agreement, showing that Greek keeps the Indo-European accent; *e.g.* in the -es(-os)-stems, ἔδος = sádas = Teut. setez; in -to-stems, κλυτός = crutás. But in -ti-stems both accentuations are found; Sanskrit has both—gātis but bhūtis; also Teutonic, as shown by gabaupī but gamundi (the variation—p or d—is due to accent, by Verner's law); while Greek has levelled, βάσις, φύσις, &c., accented on the root, though in this class the weak form of the root points to original *suffix* accent.

II. When the historic accent comes earlier in the word than the secondary accent, the secondary wins.

Thus Greek has γενέταιρα, Sanskrit jānītī—doubtless the original form; ἡδιον is older than ἡδιών, Sanskrit svādīyān. This law specially affected compounds, *e.g.* ὀνόμα-κλυτος for older *ὀνόμα-κλυτος (Sanskrit nāma-crutás). Such attributive compounds were certainly in Indo-European accented on the first member; but the new law often

¹ Whether this new accent was a pitch-accent from the beginning, or a secondary stress-accent passing afterwards into pitch, Wheeler does not say; and, indeed, the absence of any definition of the sense in which he uses the term 'accent' is a fault.

forced the accent on to the second; thus *χιτών* made originally **όίό-χιτων*; but this became *οίοχίτων*—which is neither one thing nor the other. This tendency to bring the accent nearer to the end of the word, under stress of the new law, seems to have developed in Greek the curious result that (even when admissible) the accent does not stand in these compounds further back than the last syllable of the first member, *e.g.* *Πολύ-φρον*, *ἀελλό-πος*; and when the last syllable of the first member is absorbed into the first of the second, this keeps the accent, as *κακοῦργος*, *γλαυκῶπις*.

III. Where the original and the secondary accent fall on the same syllable, the accent remains there. This is natural, and exceptions are rare: *έκυρός*¹ for **έκυρος* (Sanskrit *çvácuras*) is probably due to *έκυρά*; *πειθερός* (so Brugmann) may have helped. In *οὐρανός* = *Váruna*, the Greek may have kept the original form: for the adjectival suffix *-anó* bears the accent in *ικανός*, &c., just as in Sanskrit, *tvaranás*, &c.; only where the verb accents on the root, does Sanskrit accent these adjectives on the root-syllable, *dháranaś*, &c.; which explains *Várunas*.

IV. Oxytones with dactylic ending become paroxytones.

Thus of adjectives in *-ρος* (*-λος*), *έρυθρός* (= Sanskrit *rudhirás*), and *έσθλός*, *χθαμαλός*, &c., represent the original accentuation. But *άγκύλος* (dactylic) is changed from the original type seen in Sanskrit *an-kurás*, Anglo-Saxon *angel* (angle), where *g* shews that the accent followed. Similar are *αἰόλος*, *καμπύλος*, *Αἰσχύλος*, *ποικίλος* (Sanskrit *peçalás*); also secondaries, *δριμύλος*; but *παχυ-λός* (*bahwlós*). Exceptions are *όμφαλός*, *μῦελός*. Again, the principle (Wheeler holds) appears in perf. pass. participles. Sanskrit *-māná*, corresponding generally to *-μενο-*, is always oxytone. And this oxytone appears in Greek in proper names like *Σωζομενός*, *Τισαμενός*, which from the isolation caused by their being specialised into

¹ If it be asked why it is maintained that the Sanskrit accent is here right and the Greek wrong, the answer is given by the Teutonic. Here we have for 'father-in-law' in O.H.G. *swelur*, and in A.S. *sweor* (where an *h* is lost); for 'mother-in-law' O.H.G. *swigar*, A.S. *swiger*. Here the occurrence of the *h* proves that the accent in original Teutonic was on the first syllable of the word, the *g* that it was on the last—in agreement with Sanskrit *çvácuras* (masc.), *çvaçrū* (fem.). This result is one of many due to 'Verner's Law' (*K.Z.* 23, 97). As every educated Englishman has at least a distant acquaintance with 'Grimm's Law,' it is somewhat strange how little Verner's article (1877), which shews how a set of regular exceptions to Grimm's law is caused by the operation of a wider (accentual) law, is known in England.

proper names remain outside the verb-system and so are not affected by its analogy. Similarly we have *δεξαμενή* (cistern), *είαμενή* (low ground). But the ordinary present participles are proparoxytones, following the analogy of the present tense, *σωζόμενος* (for original **σώζομενος*), &c.; similarly the aorists, *τισάμενος*. Now Wheeler sees no reason why perfects like *λελεγμένος* should not have done the same—except for the above law; they are regularly dactylic; and others, which are not, could be accented on analogy, *λελυμένος*, *τεταμένος*. This is ingenious, but not perfectly convincing. He lastly applies the same principle to solve the difficulties in the accentuation of objective compounds (such as *μητροκτόνος*, *θεοβλαβής*) and of determinatives (like *άκρόπολις*). There seems to have been an Indo-European difference in these, reflected in Vedic and Greek, according as the second member was substantival or adjectival, and (in the last case) a simple adjective or participle, or a verbal adjective. The main principle in Indo-European was to keep the accent on its proper syllable in the second member of an objective compound—as shewn in *αἰγοβοσκός*, *amitra-khādá*, &c. If the second be a substantive, this rule holds in the main; the variations belong in the main to special classes, *e.g.* to the *-ti*-nouns in Vedic, but in Greek (increasingly throughout) to *o*-nouns, as *πατρ-άδελφος*; if it be a simple adjective, there is much more tendency to throw back, *e.g.* *παναίολος* (*αιόλος*), *dānu-citra*; this is regular in Vedic for negative compounds (*á-martya*) and in both languages for participles (*devákṛta*, *άδάκρυτος*). The commonest however of the adjectival class are those compounds where the second member is a verbal adjective, generally no longer found out of composition;² here Sanskrit and Greek agree very well in keeping the accent on the second member, *μητρο-κτόνος* (as opposed to *μητρό-κτονος*, the attributive compound). But why have we such variations as *αἰγοβοσκός* and *μητροκτόνος*? A considerable number occur in Vedic also. Von Schröder (*K.Z.* 24, 122) was the first to suggest that when the penultima was short it was accented, but if long, the word was oxytone; this does not account however for the many exceptions in both languages. Wheeler holds that his dactylic law explains these; see his lists, pp. 89, 90, *ναυστόλος*, *τελεσφόρος*,

² This fact implies that the *type* is *old* (no doubt many examples of it are late); if so, we may fairly infer that the oxytone forms (*αἰγοβοσκός*, *διοτρεφής*, *άλιαής*) are older than the paroxytone, for a change from oxytone backwards suits the new principle; a change from paroxytone to oxytone would not.

ἐκηβόλος, &c., but δημαγωγός, βουπομπός, &c. But he also has to account for the numerous forms like δημοβόρος, δειπνολόχος, which are paroxytone yet *not* dactylic, and these are more numerous than his account would imply. He suggests the analogy of the dactylic forms, which is possible, but hardly probable. In support of his dactylic theory he refers (without committing himself) to de Saussure's 'rhythmic law' (*Mélanges Graux*, p. 737), which lays down (in brief) a Greek tendency to avoid three final short syllables; this 'law,' which de Saussure applied ingeniously to explain σοφώτερος, φίλ(ο)τερος, σκεδάννυμεν (for σκεδᾶ-νῦμεν), &c., was not worked out by its author and has met with little acceptance (see Brugmann, *K Z.* 27, 590). Wheeler's explanation seems rather better than any other, and that is as much as can be said of it.¹

V. When the historic accent lay nearer

¹ Wheeler notes that many compounds seemingly of this kind are rather to be regarded as attributive, e.g. ἐύρροος = 'having a fair stream,' rather than 'fair-flowing.' The difficulty of drawing the line between determinative and attributive compounds might well cause some confusion of accent.

the end of the word than the natural place of the secondary accent, a battle ensued, and the result varied.

To take a very few examples, the historic survived in ἑκατόν, ἑννέα, &c., in past participles (λελοιπώς), stems in ης (δυσμενής), &c. On the other hand the secondary accent comes in ordinals (τέταρτος, against caturthás) in some numeral-attributives (δίπους, dvipád), in negative attributives (ἄνυδρος, anudrás)—and a good many cases hardly classifiable.

There is a good collection (p. 112 &c.) of words where the accentuation changed in historic times as τροπαῖον (old) τρόπαιον (new), ἔρημος and ἔρημος. Generally, but not always, the change works backward, as might be expected. Sometimes analogy operated, as in μωρός, later for μῶρος (Attic). There is also a list of words where double accentuation has been utilised for differentiation of meaning.

Probably enough has been said to shew that this book deserves the attention of all who desire to understand the principles underlying the seeming mysteries of accentuation.

JOHN PEILE.

LEXICONS TO THE GREEK TESTAMENT.

A Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament, being Grimm's Wilke's Clavis Novi Testamenti. Translated, Revised and Enlarged by JOSEPH HENRY THAYER, D.D., Bussey Professor of New Testament Criticism and Interpretation in the Divinity School of Harvard University. Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark. 1886. 4to. pp. 726. 36s.

Biblico Theological Lexicon to New Testament Greek. By HERMANN CREMER, D.D., Professor of Theology in the University of Greifswald. Third English Edition. With Supplement. Translated from the latest German Edition by WILLIAM URWICK, M.A. Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark. 1886. 4to. pp. 943. 38s.

GRIMM'S *Clavis* has long been familiar to students as an invaluable help to the study of the New Testament. As Prof. Schürer said (in 1878), 'it is not only unquestionably the best among existing New Testament lexicons but is a work of the highest intrinsic merit . . . and ought to be regarded by every student as one of the first

and most necessary requisites for the study of the New Testament, and consequently for the study of theology in general.' And, as Prof. Thayer truly says, any one who consults such articles as δίκαιος, κόσμος, πίστις or other important terms will find all the materials for a complete exposition of the biblical contents of these terms. Prof. Thayer has added largely to the value and utility of the work. First he has taken full account of the diversity of readings not only in Griesbach, Lachmann, and Tischendorf (as Grimm had partly done), but also of Tregelles and Westcott and Hort. It need not be pointed out how essential this is to the student. Thus under δευτερόπρωτος he not only mentions the critical evidence, but gives abundant references to the writers who discuss the question of its genuineness. Under πρεσβύτερος again he does not fail to note the opinion which regards that word in *Philom.* 9 as = πρεσβυτήρ. Synonyms are briefly discussed; and the renderings of the Revised Version are carefully noted. For the sake of those who desire to search further into what has been said of any particular word, references are given to the

best expositors German and English. The list of authors prefixed by no means exhausts these; for instance we find Mr. McClellan's *Greek Testament* and Dr. Field's admirable *Otium Norvicense* have been consulted. The Appendix presents us with a series of most valuable lists, first, of post-Aristotelian words and significations (again subdivided according to date of occurrence); next, lists of Biblical words and significations; and finally fourteen lists of words peculiar to individual writers of the New Testament. These lists will be found extremely useful, but, as a caution against the misuse of them, Prof. Thayer very properly reminds us of the 'monumental misjudgments committed by some who have made questions of authorship turn on vocabulary alone.' It will be seen from this that Grimm's *Lexicon* has become a veritable encyclopaedia of New Testament Greek. It may be added that of the 5420 words composing the vocabulary of the New Testament there are no less than 5260 of which every occurrence is noticed.

CREMER'S *Lexicon*, as its name implies, does not aim at the same exhaustiveness. The author does not undertake to enter upon that part of the vocabulary for which the lexicons of Classical Greek suffice. He directs his attention to the expressions which are affected by 'the language-moulding power of Christianity.' The excellence of the work within these limits is so thoroughly appreciated by English students who have had the translation in their hands for several years that we need only refer to the new matter in the new edition. Not only have there been many alterations and additions in the existing articles but 300 new articles have been added. All this additional matter has been brought together by the translator in a supplemental volume of 323 pages.

It will be interesting to compare the treatment of an important word in these two *Lexicons*. I select one which is not concerned in any theological controversy, the word *μυστήριον*. This word throughout the New Testament (except in the Apocalypse) has, it seems to me, but one meaning viz. something once hidden but now revealed, as St. Paul expresses it in Rom. xvi. 25, what we may call truths of revelation. These are the 'mysteries of the kingdom of heaven,' which our Lord says it was given to the disciples to know; not 'mysterious things,' as Robinson (in his *Lexicon*) has it. It is of these that St. Paul says, 'if I know all mysteries and all knowledge...but have not love, I am nothing.'

Grimm gives *μυστήριον* these three senses, (1) a hidden or secret thing not obvious to the understanding, (2) a hidden purpose or counsel, (3) the mystic or hidden sense. With the exception of Eph. v. 32 all the passages referred to the last head are in the Apocalypse. To the second head he refers all the rest except two. His exposition is in general very good but I can see no good reason for including 'purpose' in the meaning of the word. The fact that it is often applied to Divine purposes does not justify our including this idea in its signification. But letting this pass, we come to the two passages referred to the first head, viz. 1 Cor. xiii. 2, xiv. 2. In the latter passage St. Paul says of the man who speaks with a tongue but is not understood 'howbeit in the spirit he speaketh mysteries.' This is generally taken to mean 'he is uttering things unintelligible' (so Bretschneider in his *Lexicon*). This would be mere tautology of the worst kind, repeating in an obscure form what had just been said quite clearly οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἀκούει. If these words followed, instead of preceding, the interpretation might be tolerable. Again the meaning thus assigned to *μυστήριον* is too remote from its usual sense, especially in St. Paul, to be admitted without necessity. But there is no necessity; the usual meaning suits the context perfectly. 'He speaketh not unto men but unto God, for no man understands him, although I admit that he is with his spirit uttering profound truths.' Thus the words supply just that delicate softening of οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἀκούει which is characteristically Pauline. We have an exact parallel in: 'thou verily givest thanks well, but the other is not edified.' The other example of the signification 'hidden or secret thing,' viz. 1 Cor. xiii. 2, has been already quoted, and there is certainly no reason for assigning the word an unusual signification in that passage. There appears to be more reason for separating Eph. v. 32, which Grimm refers to the third head, yet there too I think the usual signification gives not only a good but a better sense: τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν, ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω εἰς Χριστὸν καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, i.e. 'this truth is an important one, I mean in reference to Christ and His Church, not in reference to marriage.' It is surely the statement about Christ that is μέγα, not the hidden sense of the text cited. Even if St. Paul had not used the word elsewhere, we should not think it Pauline to talk about deep mystic senses. The English version of this verse is particularly misleading. It is hard for the English

reader in any case to keep clear of the association of the word mystery with what is 'mysterious,' but the adjective 'great' here makes it impossible. A 'great mystery' can only mean in English something of which the mysteriousness is great. Now the Greek μέγα cannot possibly have this meaning. The Revised Version corrects the grammatical error of the Authorised Version, but retains the misleading use of the word 'great.' Cremer gives as the signification of μυστήριον (1) a knowledge of hidden things, (2) that which is withdrawn from knowledge, which is hidden as the object of Divine revelation. Eph. vi. 19 γνωρίζαι τὸ μ. τοῦ εὐαγγελίου he refers to the former head, and Eph. i. 9 γνωρίσας ἡμῖν τὸ μ. τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ to the latter. It is hard to see the ground of this distinction.

Again the word κατείδωλον furnishes a good instance of the difference between Grimm's and Cremer's mode of treatment. Cremer interprets it 'wholly given up to the worship of false gods.' It seems to us that St. Paul's speech would suffer if we suppose that he meant the word to convey this idea. It is certain that his hearers would not so understand it. Grimm's simple 'full of idols' is on every account preferable.

Under εὐτραπεία Grimm refers to Aristotle as giving the word a milder sense than St. Paul (*Eth. Nic.* ii. 7, 13); and Prof. Thayer quotes the definition given (*Rhet.* ii. 12, 16) πεπαιδειμένη ὕβρις. But it is worth noticing that in another place (*Eth.* iv. 8, 4) Aristotle expressly states that the word was commonly applied to what was properly βωμολοχία. The words are: ἐπιπολάζοντος δὲ τοῦ γελοίου, καὶ τῶν πλείστον χαϊρόντων τῇ παιδίᾳ καὶ τῷ σκόπτειν μᾶλλον ἢ δεῖ, καὶ εἰ βωμολόχοι εὐτράπελοι προσαγορεύονται ὡς χαρίεσες. Time would naturally confirm this use of the word; so that St. Paul's condemnation of εὐτραπεία is fully accounted for.

We may be permitted to question a distinction drawn by Grimm between ἀκοῖαν φωνῆς and ἀκοῖαν φωνήν. The former according to him means 'to perceive the distinct words of a voice.' Now the most important passages bearing on this distinction are Acts ix. 4, 7 and xxii. 7, 9. In ix. 4 we are told that Saul 'heard a voice saying' (acc.), in xxii. 7 he himself says 'I heard a voice saying' (gen.). Here the expressions seem to be synonymous; but now consider what is said of his companions. In ix. 7 they 'heard the voice' (gen.), whereas in xxii. 9 they 'heard not the voice' (acc.). We can imagine a writer reconciling these passages by a distinction the reverse of Grimm's; we

do not see how his distinction can be upheld. Under θριαμβεύω, Grimm (with the older commentators) assigns to this verb a causative signification in 2 Cor. ii. 14. Prof. Thayer refers the reader to Meyer and Lightfoot as rejecting this sense (as the Revisers also have done). Field dismisses all reference to the Roman triumph in this place, and renders 'which always maketh a show (or spectacle) of us,' what is usually considered a disgrace being here gloried in. This is the view taken by Chrysostom and Theodoret: τουτέστι, τῷ πᾶσι ποιοῦντι περιφανείς, Chrys.; τῇδε κάκεισε περιάγει, δῆλους ἡμᾶς ἅπασιν ἀποφαίνων, Theod.

On the use of χωρέω in John viii. 37 Dr. Field again gives valuable assistance by producing from Alciphron's *Epistles* a passage in which the verb is used in a way exactly parallel with St. John's use of it here, viz. = 'locum habere.' "A parasite having been stuffed to excess by his entertainers was met on his way home by Acesilaus the physician who . . . administered a powerful emetic, the effect of which the parasite himself thus describes: 'What vessels, λέβητας, πιθάκρας, ἀμίδας did I fill with what I threw up! So that the doctor himself wondered ποῦ καὶ τίνα τρόπον ἐχώρησε τοσούτων ὁ τῶν βρωμάτων φορνυτός.'" This note is referred to by Prof. Thayer.

Under περπερεύομαι Grimm, referring to Cic. *ad Att.* i. 14 where the compound ἐμπερπερεύεσθαι occurs, states that it is there used 'of adulation, employing rhetorical embellishments in extolling another excessively.' This is erroneous; the meaning in Cicero is very close to that of the simple verb in St. Paul. 'Ego autem ipse, Dii boni quo modo ἐπερπερευσάμην novo auditori Pompeio!' Cicero himself states what the subject of his speech was; not adulation of Pompey but 'de gravitate ordinis, de equestri concordia, de consensione Italiae, de intermortuis reliquiis conjurationis, de vilitate, de otio.'

My last remark shall be on κατοπτρίζομενοι in 2 Cor. iii. 18 explained by Grimm (as by most) 'beholding as in a mirror.' It is not easy to see how the verb can have this sense. κατοπτρίζω in Plutarch¹ (*De Placitis Phil.* 3, 5, 11) means 'mirroring,' not as 'showing in a mirror' but 'showing by reflection.' The middle voice accordingly means to 'reflect oneself in a mirror' which

¹ [ἴρων εἶναι] ἀνάκλασιν ἀπὸ νέφους πυκνοῦ τῆς ἡλιακῆς περιφεγγείας, καταντικρὺ δὲ τοῦ κατοπτρίζοντος αὐτὸ ἀστέρως διαπαντός ἵστασθαι. Grimm ought to have indicated that he was not quoting the actual words.

no doubt is practically to look at oneself, but it is the reflection not the looking that the verb expresses. Following the same line of thought the word in 2 Cor. iii. 18 with the object τὴν δόξαν τοῦ Κυρίου may very naturally mean 'mirroring in ourselves,' 'reflecting.' (So the Revised Version). The ordinary interpretation 'to behold as in a mirror' seems to involve a rather violent forcing of the usual sense of the verb.

Prof. Thayer frequently adds to our knowledge of rare words. Thus for ἀνεμίջω, which

Grimm stated was only found (besides Jas. i. 6) in the Schol. on Hom. *Od.* xii. 336, Prof. Thayer gives two other references. For δαιμονιώδης, for which Grimm had given no authority except St. James, he gives references to the Schol. on Aristoph. *Ran.* 295 and to Ps. xc. 6 (Sym.). This tracking of rare New Testament words in the Scholiasts has a considerable interest, as the Scholiasts may be supposed to reflect more of the later colloquial use than classical authors.

T. K. ABBOTT.

ARNOLD'S SECOND PUNIC WAR.

The Second Punic War: being chapters of the History of Rome, by the late THOMAS ARNOLD, D.D., edited by W. T. ARNOLD, M.A. London: Macmillan & Co. 1886. 8s. 6d.

MR. ARNOLD'S edition of his grandfather's history of the Second Punic War, or more exactly, of the invasion of Italy by Hannibal, is a work not only of piety, but also of judgment, diligence, and sound scholarship. The third volume of Arnold's *History of Rome* was long ago pronounced the best written volume in the English language. The judgment was a rash one; for an order of merit is not so easily established; but if we are to resort to the latest Cambridge fashion of a liberal use of brackets, there is no doubt that it is to be placed in the first bracket of the first class; and the bracket will be a small one. Here for the first time Arnold was free from the undue fascination of Niebuhr's overmastering genius; and at the same time he allowed fuller play to his artistic feeling as to style and arrangement. The result is that, as Dr. Freeman puts it, 'the narrative even of Mommsen seems cold and tame after that of Arnold': and how far the latter is superior in moral elevation the dullest of readers cannot fail to perceive. It is a real service to have rendered this splendid fragment more accessible to school-boys and to undergraduates; while many a teacher, especially, but by no means solely, those to whom great libraries are not accessible, will be thankful for the thoroughness with which Mr. Arnold has given in seventy pages of closely printed notes the latest results of the investigations which Continental scholars have been making industriously for the last forty years into the numerous difficulties of this most interesting

and important period. The text has been carefully revised with the aid of the author's MS., and the references have throughout been verified, corrected, and in many cases adapted to recent critical editions. The eight maps which have been supplied are, with one exception, simply delightful in their accuracy and beauty of execution. The exception is unfortunately an important one. In the one which contains two plans of the battle of Cannae, the course of the river and the situation of the mountains are represented so differently in the two plans, that even allowing for the difference of scale (in itself unfortunate) it is hardly possible to conceive them clearly or consistently. The former is reduced from Vincent's *Atlas*; the source of the other is not stated; and Mr. Arnold gives no indication which is to be taken as the more authoritative. But the vexed question of the position of the Roman and the Carthaginian camps turns very largely, as Mr. Arnold admits, on topographical considerations. The question is of the more importance because the all but universal opinion at present is that Dr. Arnold was mistaken in the position that he assigned to the two armies. The editor does not defend him with any confidence, but justly points out that, if he was in error, both Livy and Polybius must have been in error likewise. I believe that there is at present no satisfactory large-scale map of this part of Italy; but we may hope that this want will be removed before long, and that so we shall have more definite guidance in a later edition.

Of the editor's own notes the most important are (A) in which he collects overwhelming evidence as to the untrustworthiness of Polybius as a geographer, thus establishing brilliantly Dr. Arnold's insight in

holding a view in his time, and long since, highly unfashionable: (*B*) in which he discusses the well-worn question of the pass by which Hannibal crossed the Alps, and sums up tellingly in favour of Mr. Freshfield's contention that it was the Col d'Argentière: (*C*) a discussion of the site of the battle of the Trebia, which proves that Mommsen's characteristic 'indisputable' is out of place: (*D*) an entirely new discussion of the route by which Hannibal crossed the Apennines: (*E*) a comparison of the accounts by Polybius and by Livy of the battle of Thrasymenus, in which no definite conclusion is arrived at:

and (*F*) a discussion of Hannibal's march on Rome in B.C. 211. But in almost all the others some interesting point is raised and discussed with thoroughness.

This new edition may fairly be said to be indispensable to any tolerable school library. It is a pity that it could not be published at half the price now set upon it. Then it might have been added that a wrong is done to every schoolboy who is reading any book of the favourite third decade of Livy, and who does not possess it as his own.

A. S. WILKINS.

Des Hadoardus Cicero-Excerpte. Mitgetheilt und bearbeitet von PAUL SCHWENKE. (Philologus: Supplementband v. 3.)

ALL those who busy themselves with Ciceronian studies owe gratitude to the editor for having performed this laborious and to a great extent thankless task. So long as it was known that a manuscript in the Vatican, reputed to be of the ninth century, and containing extracts from a number of Cicero's works, remained uncollated, scholars would have continued to spend time in partial inspections of it. It was thus well that a complete collation should be printed once for all. But after making a careful examination of a considerable portion of the readings now published, it seems to me unlikely that they will prove to be of any considerable importance for the constitution of the text of Cicero.

Dr. Schwenke opens his work with a description of the MS. which might well have been more detailed. For a fuller account of it he refers to an article in Italian by Narducci, which will be difficult of access to many readers. It is unfortunate that this full and careful collation of the MS. should not be accompanied by a statement of the particulars which have led to the determination of its age. Assuming it to be of the ninth century (after Narducci) Dr. Schwenke discusses in an interesting way the problem of its origin, and points out what light it throws on the constitution of the library to which the presbyter Hadoardus had access. Much information is also collected to show what books other libraries of the same age contained. Indeed the real interest of these excerpts lies not so much in their bearing upon Ciceronian criticism, as in the hints they afford concerning the state of culture in the age when they were compiled.

The compiler's name, Hadoardus, is given in a prefatory set of verses explaining the origin of the work. The lines are in respect of their Latinity and prosody very odious, even for the time at which they were written. At many points it is well nigh impossible to extract any sense from them. That the compiler can have understood the extracts which he made is an impossibility; for that very reason, therefore, he copied them from the MSS. at hand with remarkable fidelity on the whole. Besides the excerpts from Cicero, there are passages from Sallust, Macrobius, and Martianus Capella, not given by Schwenke (except in a few instances where they are

interwoven with the Ciceronian passages). In the introductory verses the worthy presbyter gives expression to the uneasiness which he felt in using works by authors who had no part in the holy faith, and whom he well knew to have been assigned their place within the ramparts of Gehenna. All the philosophical works of Cicero are excerpted, with the exception of the *Academia Posteriora* and the *De Republica*; though the *Somnium Scipionis* was known to Hadoardus through Macrobius. Outside the philosophical works, only the *De Oratore* is quoted. Whenever any portion of a Ciceronian work not contained in our existing MSS. of Cicero is given, it has not been taken directly from Cicero, but is an extract from some other writer; thus a fragment of the *De Fato* comes from Servius, and one or two of the *Hortensius* from Augustine. The passages excerpted are classed roughly under heads: such as 'Incipit de divina natura collectio (sic) quaedam secundum Tullium Ciceronem ceterosque philosophos ab ipso commemoratos;' and 'De natura humana maximeque secundum corporalem essentiam.' Not unfrequently the same passage comes under more than one heading. Sometimes the rough edges of the extracts, so to speak, are smoothed away by Hadoardus, so as to render the transition from one to the other less jolting; but he did not understand them sufficiently well to attempt weaving them into a continuous exposition. They remain, in fact, as he indicates, a 'collectio.' Sometimes in the body of the extracts phrases appropriate enough as they stood in Cicero, but strange when the context was broken, were changed; but very often no attempt at alteration was made, and e.g. personal pronouns were left without any indication of the persons to whom they originally referred. Hadoardus did not like the names of Greek philosophers; where they occurred in his books he often removed them, substituting *quidam* or something of the kind; but in this matter too his usage was capricious. Changes on religious grounds are much less common than was to be expected. The plural of *deus*, however, is nearly always altered to the singular. He is not shocked by the philosophic scepticism of the *Lucullus*; possibly because that had been consecrated to sacred uses by Arnobius and other Christian writers. Not often does Hadoardus make a change in order to remove what he felt to be a difficulty. When he does so, he sometimes brings about strange readings; thus in *Lucullus*, § 38, 'qui enim quid percipit,

adsentitur statim,' he alters *quid* to *nihil*, thinking that Cicero meant, 'the man who is without sense gives a hasty assent.'

The readings of the Hadoardus MS. have been supplied to Dr. Schwenke by others; but he has himself inspected anew the readings of Ciceronian MSS. of the first importance in passages quoted by Hadoardus. This portion of the work deserves especial praise. Indeed the labour expended upon the publication has been immense, and merits warm recognition. On some future occasion I may draw attention to some details arising out of Dr. Schwenke's collations.—J. S. REID.

Cicero de Senectute, edited by L. HUXLEY, B.A.
Part I.—Introduction and Text. Part II.—Notes.
(Clarendon Press.) 2s.

THIS edition has some merit of arrangement. The text and the notes are in separate volumes, an obvious advantage for school purposes; and there is a useful 'Index of Persons,' which will save reference to the Classical dictionary. Here our praise must end. The notes are much the sort of thing which might be expected from a cleverish school-boy in an unseen paper. They are given where they are not wanted, omitted where they are wanted, and they contain elementary blunders on points correctly explained by former editors. In p. 28, l. 29, if any note were given on the words *coagmentavit*, *conglutinavit*, it should have been for the purpose of explaining the metaphor contained in them, not simply to give the equivalents 'combined,' 'compounded,' the latter of which is moreover inconsistent with the words that follow, *omnis conglutinatio recens aegre, inveterata facile divellitur*. p. 6, 20, *chiasmus* is explained as 'gaping,' Mr. Huxley evidently connecting it, not with *χῆ*, but with *χαίνω*, *χάσμα*. p. 16, 15, the idiom *nunc cum maxime* is misunderstood. p. 21, 19, *jumentum* is said to be contracted from *jugumentum*. 15, 29, *dissolutos senes* is translated 'broken-down' old men. 24, 32, Cicero says there was an interval of forty-six years between the first and sixth consulship of Corvinus, *ita quantum spatium aetatis majores ad senectutis initium esse voluerunt, tantus illi cursus honorum fuit*, referring of course to the fact that after forty-six a man was classed as *senior*. Mr. Huxley says, 'his public life had lasted as many years as would bring a man to *senectus*, i.e. sixty,' and leaves it to his reader to reconcile this with the statement of Cicero. p. 23, 20, *ut in gratiam cum voluptate redeamus* (to make up our quarrel with pleasure) is rendered by the following lucid sentence 'so that we are restored at last to favour with pleasure to ourselves.' p. 29, 11, on *hoc meditatum ab adolescentia debet esse* (we must con this from our youth), we have the note 'by the persons included in *adolescencia*.' p. 27, 31, in the sentence *neque enim histrioni ut placeat peragenda fabula est* (an actor does not need to finish the play in order to secure approval), *ut placeat* is turned 'at his own pleasure.' 25, 20, *superior aetas fructus capit auctoritatis extremos* (receives the reward of influence at last), Mr. Huxley translates *extremos* 'to the full'; with which may be compared his version of *spatio supremo*, 'in the most glorious race' (p. 8, 13). It is unnecessary to give further specimens. The book is one which should never have been printed, first because the ground was already preoccupied by Mr. Reid's excellent edition, secondly because the editor has taken no pains to fit himself for the work. It is not creditable to the management of the Clarendon press that such a book should have received the stamp of its *imprimatur*.

THREE LEXICONS TO CAESAR.

Lexikon zu den Schriften Cäsars und seiner Fortsetzer mit Angabe sämtlicher Stellen von H. MERGUET.
Jena, Gustav Fischer. 1886. 4to, pp. iv, 1138, and 4 pages of corrections and additions. 55 Mk.

THIS lexicon is a companion to the author's well-known lexicon to Cicero's speeches in four volumes. It aims at the same absolute completeness, e.g. the article *et* fills 38½ columns. In many respects it is an advantage to have the latinity of Caesar and his continuators collected in one alphabet; Merguet's lexicon alone of the three rivals can boast of this advantage. In regard to the text, Merguet follows Nipperdey throughout, not recording various readings or conjectures. The arrangement, according to syntactical construction, not according to signification, is for rapid reference convenient, but has its disadvantages. It is to be regretted that the references are to chapters, not to paragraphs.

Lexicon Caesarianum confecit H. MEUSEL. Berlin, H. Weber. fasc. i—vii, col. 1—1344 (A—FUGA). 1884—1886. 2 M. 40 Pf. per part.

THIS lexicon confines itself to Caesar's own writings; it contains proper names, which are treated as in Orelli's onomasticon to Cicero; it gives various readings and emendations; the editor himself has made valuable grammatical collections, e.g. on Caesar's use of *a* and *ab*; on the use of *ac* before different letters. It is generally agreed by critics that this lexicon is *the* lexicon to Caesar.

Lexicon Caesarianum composuerunt RUDOLFUS MENGE et SIEGMUNDUS PREUSS. Leipzig, Teubner. fasc. i, ii, 1885—6. 4to. col. 1—256. 1 M. 60 Pf. each part.

THIS is the cheapest and most concise of the three lexicons. In plan and appearance it resembles the *Lexicon Taciteum* of Gerber and Greef, with which it ranges in size. Brevity is secured by giving in many cases bare references, not the full context. Various readings are recorded. The type is smaller than in Merguet and Meusel, and abbreviations save space, so that fasc. 1 in 128 columns comes down to *capillus*, which stands on col. 444 in Meusel, and on p. 132 (= col. 263) in Merguet.

A necessary supplement to both Meusel and Menge-Preuss is

Vollständiges Lexikon zu den pseudocäsarianischen Schriftwerken. Von SIEGMUND PREUSS. I Teil: *bell. Gall. 8 und bell. Alex.* II Teil: *bell. Afr. und Hisp.* Erlangen, Deichert. 1884. 8vo. pp. 433. 8 Mk.

As the two parts have separate alphabets, Merguet has a very decided claim to preference on those who wish to learn briefly the whole evidence on any word contained in the *corpus Caesarianum*.

Holder also in 1882 added a complete index to his edition of Caesar's Gallic war; and Leopold Vielhaber long since spent much labour on a lexicon to Caesar. It is greatly to be regretted that so much energy has been absorbed in rival services to one author, while the greater part of Cicero, both Senecas, Quintilian's declamations, Petronius, and many other store-houses of Latinity, have had little or nothing done for them. Teubner announced a *lexicon Lucretianum* by Woltjer as preparing in 1882, and in the same year Edm. Hauler appended to his *Terentiana* (Vienna, Hoelder) a specimen of a lexicon, which is to contain parallels from Plautus and other comic poets, Latin and Greek. May they soon appear and find many imitators.—JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

[Since the above was in type, part III of the lexicon of Menge and Preuss (to *eruptio*) and part VIII (to *Hyrrus*, completing vol. I) of that of Meusel, have appeared.]

Livy. Books V, VI, and VII, with introduction and notes by A. R. CLUER; second edition, revised by P. E. MATHESON (Clarendon Press Series) 1887. 5s.

THIS is an enlarged and revised edition of Mr. Cluer's book published in 1881. The additions consist of (1) An excursus on the style of Livy. In this, under the three heads of 'general arrangement,' 'ornaments of style,' and 'use of particular forms,' Mr. Matheson has given a sound and full account of the main peculiarities of Livy's language, as exemplified in these books. A valuable portion of the excursus is an excellent classified list of metaphors. (2) A note on the Roman army at this period, after Marquardt. (3) A useful map of Central Italy. (4) An analysis prefixed to each chapter of the text. (5) Additions to the notes, e.g., in l. 1, on *Comitia*, in vi. 41, 10, on *Patres auctores fiunt*, in vi. 41, 10 on *At hercule*. The character of these additions, which are chiefly historical, makes one regret that they are not more extensive. (6) A good index, to some extent supplementing the notes.

In revision proper Mr. Matheson has confined himself to correcting some errors in Mr. Cluer's book, as in the notes on *At enim*, which Mr. Cluer apparently mistook for *sed enim*, on *Antesignani*, wrongly explained by Mr. Cluer, and in others. One or two errors appear to have been passed over, as *signa convertit*, 'leads his troops,' which seems a loose translation. It is a pity that Mr. Matheson has not revised or remodelled the notes more extensively. There are a number of fragments of translation, of which it is difficult to see the utility, such as, *tantum abest ut . . . ut*, 'so far from . . . that' (this occurs three times), *ratio habetur*, 'regard should be had,' *duobus captivis*, 'guided by the prisoners,' &c., &c. These might well have been excised (stereotyping permitting), and the room so gained advantageously occupied by additional notes, as, for example, on the origin of the Roman Drama (vii. 2), and on *jus gentium* (v. 36, 6). Notes on these and other similar points from Mr. Matheson would clearly have been very useful, while references to Teuffel's *Rom. Lit.* and Maine's *Ancient Law*, are not practically of much use to schoolboys, or even to most undergraduates. On the other hand some pieces of translation might well have been supplemented or superseded by explanations. *Utique*, 'decidedly,' *ultra offerrent* (which by the way should be *se ultra offerrent*) 'openly faced,' may enable a boy to translate the phrases, but will not instruct him much.

Looking at the book as a whole, however, Mr. Matheson may certainly be said to have improved Mr. Cluer's book into a sound and very useful school and college edition.

H. M. STEPHENSON.

Methods of Historical Study, and Chief Periods of European History. By EDWARD A. FREEMAN, M.A., Hon. D.C.L. and LL.D., Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford. 1886. 10s. 6d.

THESE volumes form two introductory courses of lectures delivered by Professor Freeman at Oxford, and forming, together with a minute study of Gregory of Tours and Paulus Diaconus, his first year's work in the Chair of Modern History.

The earlier course sets forth the propædæutic of Historical Study, its relations to cognate or sub-

sidary sciences, and its methods and instruments of investigation. Amid much in these lectures which is of only secondary importance, that which deals with 'original authorities' is especially worthy of study. Compared with the critical thoroughness with which original authorities are treated, the lecture on subsidiary authorities is a little disappointing. Professor Freeman indeed recognises the importance of inscriptions and coins, but in insisting that their province is merely to illustrate, explain, and correct, he seems hardly to appreciate as highly as it deserves the very large amount of positive and original information which epigraphy has furnished for the Roman empire of the first three centuries. At least the examples which are given are not the most striking which might have been selected, and one would gladly exchange the whole of the lecture on Modern Historians for a fuller treatment of the uses and methods of epigraphical evidence.

In the second course of lectures Professor Freeman is at his best. He is using his instruments instead of explaining their construction, and the perhaps too sustained rhetoric of the earlier volume is less noticeable amid the wonderful fertility and aptness of illustration which is nowhere more marked than here. The abiding influence of Rome on European History is illustrated in its rise, its headship, its material but not moral decline, and its ultimate disappearance. Of course, as Professor Freeman observes, the division of European History into periods is partly arbitrary, but surely, if it is to centre round the power of Rome, the first three centuries of the empire deserve somewhat greater prominence than is here assigned to them. While the lecture on the Headship of Rome practically ends with Julius Caesar, the next passes on at once to the universal citizenship granted by Caracalla. And yet in the interval thus left two of the most important factors of the succeeding age were evolved—the Romanisation of the west, and the successive steps towards the administrative unity of the whole. Neither of them had really commenced at the accession of Augustus; both were well on their way towards completion when 'Rome became merged in Romania.' Briefly as the periods selected are necessarily sketched, and concentrated as the point of view is on Rome's oecumenical position, a few felicitous phrases often light up a whole epoch. That 'the mission of the Greek race was to be the teachers, the lights, the beacons of mankind, but not their rulers,' is no less true than epigrammatic; while the description of the zones within zones of Hellenic culture ranging from the old Hellas to the Greek court varnish of the Parthian kings sums up the intellectual characteristics of five centuries. The two lectures on 'Rome the Head of Europe' and 'Rome and the New Nations' will well repay the most careful study. Especially striking is the comparison between the gradual building up of the Roman power and its gradual falling away. The same stages of alliance, heriotship and dependence are seen in both, 'but in the one case alliance is a decent name for subjection which the time has not yet come to press to an extreme point, while in the other it is a decent name for independence which the time has not yet come formally to acknowledge.' The essay on Greek Cities under Roman Rule which is added to the volume is perhaps deprived of some of its importance by Mommsen's brilliant chapter on 'Greek Europe' in his new volume, where the same subject is treated in a more exhaustive and systematic way.

G. HARDY.

Lectures on the Rise and Early Constitution of Universities, with a Survey of Medieval Education, A.D. 200-1350, by S. S. LAURIE, A.M., Professor of the Institutes and History of Education in the University of Edinburgh. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1886. Pp. v.—xii.; 293. 6s.

IN publishing fifteen lectures which the fulness of his programme has not permitted him to deliver to his class, Mr. Laurie has given a practical example of that intellectual productiveness which, as he sets himself to show, is the true moral end of academical endowments.

The book is addressed chiefly to schoolmasters interested in educational origins. It occupies a place somewhat similar to that taken by Prof. H. Malden's smaller book half a century ago; and, like Peacock's *Observations on the Cambridge Statutes*, it may stimulate an interest in scholastic institutions from a practical point of view.

Lectures I.—IV. only (or portions of them) fall properly within the scope of this *Review*. In these the author sketches briefly the academic position of Athens, the collegiate education in Alexandria, and the more systematic organization of Rome. He shows how the Christian Church took up the torch just when the Romano-Hellenic educational system had lost all moral vitality, and when there was no faculty with sufficient energy to hold it, excepting that of jurisprudence (pp. 9, 19), which apparently he does not think to be very trustworthy for keeping alive the flame of science (p. 252*n*). He discusses the attitude of the Fathers towards 'Humanity,' and their differences of opinion on the subject. In this connexion Jerome's letter to Magnus (*Ep.* 83 or 84) ascribed to 397, the very year before a council of Karthage gave a decision on the matter, might have been thought worthy of notice. After the rise of the schools of Cassian and Benedict, where sometimes the Greek *trivium* was pursued within the narrowed range of monastic limitations, we come to the Irish schools, and so to Theodore of Tarsus, Alcuin, and Bede, and to the schools under Bishops and Chancellors of Cathedrals.

Here the reader will probably be encouraged to turn to the special work of Mr. Mullinger on the Schools of Charles the Great, as, later on, to his larger *History of Cambridge*.

When Prof. Laurie speaks of the 'Greek' period at St. Gall as 'short-lived,' he is presumably correct; but it may be worth while to notice the curious survival of the Greek language in their early tenth century Notkerian troper (No. 484) which was exhibited in the gallery of the Albert Hall in 1885, and is described in Mr. Weale's *Music Loan Exhibition catalogue*.

We must not here follow beyond our limits to the School of Salerne (who, by the way, wrote better verse than to call themselves *tota schola Salerni*), Paris, Bologna, and Prague; nor yet to Oxford and Cambridge. When Mr. Laurie issues the second edition which he contemplates, he will, I hope, add a list of universities down to the present time

arranged in the sequence of centuries, inserting such dates as to royal or papal recognition, &c., as have a documentary basis. A short index, though not very necessary in a book of this size, would serve to bring out one of its features (which has a certain interest to our readers) the definitions or etymologies of such terms as *baccalaureus*, *determinare*, *universitas*. On *cursorie* he ventures an independent suggestion.

CHR. WORDSWORTH.

A Course of Modern Greek, or the Greek Language of the Present Day. By D. ZOMPOLIDES, Ph.D. Part I., Elementary Method. Williams and Norgate. 5s.

THIS little volume is the first of a promised series of four, which, when completed, will probably form a Modern Greek Course of considerable thoroughness. Mr. Zompolides tells us in his preface, that he has followed a new and independent plan, in so far as he has arranged his material according to standard Ancient Greek grammars, while he has endeavoured to represent every form of the Modern Greek language always in comparison with the Ancient Greek. The latter aim, it would seem, might in several cases have been more fully carried out. In remarking on the history of the language Mr. Zompolides fixes the date for the beginning of its present structure at about the commencement of the eleventh century A.D.; a question which admits of a variety of opinions.

This introductory volume is divided into three parts. The first deals with the pronunciation. Commenting shortly on the vexed question of accents Mr. Zompolides says: 'It is an empty philological speculation to contend that the quantitative prosody does not congrue (?) or does not exist together with the accentual prosody, because one forgets the uniting medium of both, viz. music, which in ancient times was and will always be the anima (*ἡ ψυχή*) of poetry.'

The second division treats of the Accidence, beginning with the verb. It seems a pity that the ancient form of the Infinitive, which is frequently used at the present day, and is found in the grammars of the national schools of Greece, should be bracketed as Ancient Greek only. Also in the verbs in *μ* the original forms, as sometimes, even though rarely used, might advisedly be given as well as the modern ones.

The third division, consisting of vocabularies, and exercises from English into Greek and Greek into English, is well suited to assist the student in rapidly acquiring the language. At the conclusion a few letters are given as specimens of the epistolary style, but there is a want of number and variety, a defect it would be well to correct in a future edition.

The whole book is simple in its arrangements and practical for non-classical students; and is sufficient to guide the classical student to a rapid knowledge of the language as now spoken.

M. C. DAWES.

CARMEN SAECULARE GRAECE REDDITUM.

Νίκη νικήφορος.

- εἶδον δεκάκισ πέντ' ἐνιαυτοὶ ρόδα φοινίσσοντα μαραίνειν,
 πίπτειν εἶδον στάχυν ὡσαύτως ἀνθηράν, ἐξ ὅτου ἡμῖν
 νωμᾷ σκῆπτρον σφαῖράν τε λαβοῦσ' ἢ πολύτιμος βασιλεια.
 τίνα γὰρ μύθοις, τίν' ἐν ἱστορίαις οὕτως ἀγαθὴν τε φίλην τε
 5 ὥς τὴν ἡμῶν βασιλεύουσαν, τὴν Ἰνδοῖς πᾶσι σεβαστὴν,
 εὖροις ἄν; ἐπεὶ προγόνων οὐδεὶς ᾧδ' ἄξιος ἐστεφανώθη,
 ᾧ τόσον ἤδη χρόνον ἔκτεται διαδήματι· νῦν δ' ἄρ' ἀφίκεται
 τέλος οἰωνῶν μετὰ χρηστοτάτων πολλῇ θ' ἅμα πλουθυγείᾳ.
 πεντηκοστὸν πολύκαρπον ἔτος, καὶ συγχαίρουσι πολῖται.
 10 ἄνομον γὰρ ἄπεστ' ἦθος ἀγεῖνές θ', ὑπερήφανά τ' ἔργα τυράννου,
 ἀλλ' ἐπικεῖς χαρίεσσά τ' ἔφνυ, χῶπόια πρέπει βασιλείαν.—
 τοιγαροῦν ὑμεῖς, πολῖται, δώματ' εὐτρεπίζετε,
 λαμπάσιν πόλεις φλεγέσθων, ὡς ἐορτῆς ἄξιον,
 καὶ μὴ ὁμφῇ τῶν κροτούντων καρδίας ἀπ' εὐφρονος
 15 κοινούφρωνι, σεμνὸν γὰρ ἐστὶ φῶς τόδ', ἡχέϊω τορῶς·
 τίς γὰρ οὐκ ἂν ἀσχολοίῃ, πᾶσιν ὡς νομίζεται;
 Καὶ τὸ γυναικῶν κλέος ἐστὶ γυνή, βασιλειῶν ὡς βασιλεια,
 συγχαίρει γὰρ χαίροντι λέω, κάμνει θ' ἅμα τοῖσι καμνοῦσιν.
 εἰ τινες πλούτῳ σφριγᾶτε, μηδαμῶς φείδεσθε νῦν·
 20 συγκαλεῖτε τοὺς πένητας δαιτὺς ἐς κοινωνίαν,
 ἀφθόνῳ τ' ἱᾶσθε χρυσῷ τῶν πέλας νοσήματα·
 τοὺς κόπῳ δαμέντας αἰνῶ θάλπετ', εὐεστῶ δότε
 τοῖς ἀδημονοῦσι. νῦν γὰρ πάντες εὐωχοῦμεθα.
 εἰ τῶν προγόνων δοιοὶ ποτ' ἔτη δεκάκισ πέντ' εἶδον ἄνακτες,
 25 μνήμη προλιποῦσα γεγήρακεν, τὰ δὲ πάππου φροῦδα βέβηκεν.
 στήσον ἡμῖν, ᾧ φίλ' ἀνδρῶν, ᾧ μέλει τὰ τοιάδε,
 δῶμα λαμπρὸν εὖ τύποισι βασιλικοῖς ἡσκημέϊον,
 σύμβολ' ἐμποίων προσήκοντ' εὐγενεῖ τυραινίδι
 τοῖς ἔπειτα μαρτυρήσον, οἷος ἦν ἡμῖν ἔρως
 30 καιρὸν ἀξίοισι τιμᾶν τόνδε θησαυρίσμασιν.
 Χρήματα πλείω κατ' ἔτος μὲν αἰεὶ νῆες προσάγουσ'· ὁ δ' ἀγανῆς
 σοφίας πλείων ὄρος ἐκτέταται, καὶ τέρματα μείζονος ἀρχῆς.
 ἀλλὰ παῖδες Ἀλβίωνος, οἷς παρέσχεν ἢ Τύχη
 γῆς κρατεῖν, τέχνας τ' ἐπασκείν πολυπόνοις μοχθήμασι,
 35 Ἰνδικὴν θ' ὅσοι κατοικεῖτ' ἢ Λιβυστικὴν χθόνα
 Καναδίαν τε, τὴν τε νῆσον τὴν ἐπώνυμον νότου,
 ταῦτά καρδίαις φρονοῦντες εὐτόνοις γηρύμασιν
 τὴν ἔτος τόδ' εὐθενούσης κύριον τυραννίδος
 νῦν ἄγουσαν εὐλογεῖτε, πέμπετ' αἰσιμιον μέλος.—
 40 Εἰ γὰρ βροντῇ παραμυκᾶται τ', ἀμειγνὰ τε φῦλα κατ' ὄρφηγιν
 φοιτᾷ φοβερῶς, πείθειθε Θεῶ τῷ φωσφόρῳ, ὅς γε φανείται
 ἡγήτωρ τοῖς τῆσδε πολίταις, ἔστ' ἂν βροντήματα λήγῃ
 φῦλά θ' ἅμ' ἔρρη σκυόεντα φάος νικηφόρον ἐκπροφυγόντα,
 44 σκεδάσῃ τ' ὄρφηγιν πολύνυμος Ἔως αἰώνιον ἡμᾶρ ἄγουσα.

E. D. STONE.

NOTES.

ARISTOPH. *Acharn.* 36.—While I fully appreciate the ingenuity of Mr. A. S. Murray's rendering of this line in p. 3 of our first number, and consider his view of *πρίων* to be perfectly legitimate as a hypothesis, yet I am not by any means persuaded that this is the meaning of the scholiast whom he cites. The words, which will be found in p. 3 of Didot's edition of the scholia (not in the earlier editions) are *χὼ πρίων ἀπῆν*. —*τοῦτο παιδιά καλεῖται ἀπὸ γὰρ τοῦ πρίω ῥήματος ὕνομα τὸ πρίων*. Mr. Murray prefers to understand *τ.π.κ.* in the literal sense ('there is a game called by this name') rather than in the metaphorical ('this is what is called a pun'). In favour of his interpretation it may be urged that the lexicons do not recognize 'pun' as a meaning of *παιδιά*, and that, if the scholiast had meant this, he would probably have said *τοῦτο πέπαικται*, as he does elsewhere. On the other hand, if the literal translation were intended, we should rather have expected *παιδιά τις τοῦτο καλεῖται*, and the following *γάρ* would be difficult to account for. But what settles the matter to my mind is, that we find an exact parallel in the note on l. 8, *ἄξιον γὰρ Ἑλλάδι.—τοῦτο παρῳδιά καλεῖται*. Apparently the scholiast thought it necessary at the commencement of his commentary on Aristophanes to explain what was meant by certain figures of speech. Instead of saying briefly, as he does later on, 'observe the pun,' 'observe the parody,' he condescends to the ignorance of beginners and says 'this is what is called a parody' or 'a pun.' I think therefore that the lexicons may safely add this to their meanings of the word *παιδιά*, and that, unless further evidence is forthcoming, we must continue to understand the pun of Aristophanes in the old way, taking *πρίων* as a *double entendre* of the saw and the man who shouts 'who'll buy,' ('the rasping sound of the crier was unheard'). It is perhaps worth mention that we read in Aristot. *Probl.* 35, 3 of the sound of

a saw, at work or being sharpened, as something which makes the flesh creep (*φρίττειν ποιεῖ*).

JOSEPH B. MAYOR.

EUR. *Ion*, 978—

σὺ δ' ἀλλὰ παιῖδα τὸν ἐπὶ σοὶ πεφηνότα.

Paley's translation is;—'Do you then slay the youth who has appeared as a usurper over you,' *i.e.* over your house. I prefer to take *ἐπὶ σοὶ* as simply, 'to your injury.' Cf. 1188, *παιδὶ τῷ πεφηνότι*. It was very objectionable that he should 'turn up' at all.

EUR. *Ion*, 1027—

προλάζυμαι γοῦν τῷ χρόνῳ τῆς ἡδονῆς.

This verse is translated by Paley, 'If I have not already slain him, at least I have a foretaste of the pleasure by the time.' I venture to differ from this rendering. I rather see in the line an implied assent to the proposal for immediate action. Creusa had no particular hostility to Ion, and intended to wait till he had actually invaded her home. She had before consented to put the intruder out of the way, and now, being further pressed to act at once, she yields 'Well, be it so; it is not quite right, but, at any rate, I shall get my satisfaction earlier,' or, 'in point of time I at any rate anticipate my pleasure.'—

FREDERIC T. COLBY.

ARCHAIC FIBULAE WITH INCISED DESIGNS.—Furtwaengler in *Arch. Zeit.* 1884, p. 105, gives a small list of bronze and gold fibulae with side plates engraved with designs, and says that he knows of no other examples; in my sale catalogue of the Biliotti Collection (Dec. 1885), Nos. 607–8, three more are mentioned; the process of cleaning which was successful in those cases has been recently applied to two more in the British Museum from Kamiros, which now show similar geometric patterns.—[C. S.]

UNIVERSITY INTELLIGENCE.

TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN.

OUR Classical school at Dublin may be said to date from about thirty years ago. Previous to that time, the College Fellowships were given for Mathematical knowledge exclusively. The course usually pursued by an aspirant for Fellowship was rather a curious one. The Foundation Scholarships (commonly called Scholarships of the House) were given upon an examination in Classics. The examiners were the Seven Senior Fellows, who then constituted the governing body of the College and University. The qualification was almost entirely limited to the power of fluent *viva voce* translation of a tolerably wide selection of books—all those read for Ordinary and Honour Examinations in the first, second, and up to Trinity Term of the third year. As a rule, intending candidates for Fellowship competed at this Scholarship Examination. It might be taken up in any year, but the usual time was the Trinity term of the third year. An intending candidate Fellow, if he failed, might perhaps go up again in the year following; but this was not very usual. If however he secured his Scholarship, or if on the other hand he made up his mind not to compete again, in either case he dropped Classics altogether, and gave himself up wholly to Mathematics. At one time there was a so-called Examination in *Literis Humanioribus* as part of the Fellowship course; but it was wholly perfunctory. No attempt was made to test linguistic

or grammatical knowledge, to say nothing of taste or scholarship. The examination began with the stock question *Quid est chronologia?* to which the respondent was expected to return the stock answer, *Ea scientia, sine qua historia indigesta moles est!* Then followed a string of equally stock questions and answers in the traditional chronology of Abp. Usher or some such old world authority. As time went on, the examination became somewhat more of a reality; but the real competition was in Mathematics, and into that the candidates put all their strength, whether they had or had not been Scholars of the House. The consequence was that at one time the Fellows might have been divided into three pretty sharply marked classes. Some were distinguished Mathematicians who had either never known any Classics or had forgotten any they ever knew. Many were good 'all round' men, leaning more to Mathematics however than to Classics, and in no case what would be called 'scholars' in the present acceptation of the word. Lastly, there were a few who had comfortably forgotten their Latin and Greek and had acquired just as much Mathematics as would secure a Fellowship, which feat accomplished, they proceeded to forget that too. It must be said, however, of some of the Fellows who had been Scholars of the House, that they kept their Classical learning up, and came to the front as teachers or in some other way, in spite

of the drawbacks we have described. In the last century and beginning of the present, Stock and Walker edited Demosthenes, Lucian, Livy and other books, and did good service as teachers. Not long since died in a country rectory at a very advanced age an ex-Fellow named Hincks who (though best known as an astronomer) won some distinction as a Classical Archaeologist. The eccentric Dr. Barrett ('Jacky' Barrett, as he was irreverently called) was a Palaeographer and restored the 'Codex Rescriptus.' Coming down to our own time Dr. Stack's name must not be omitted. His heart was thoroughly in the work of Classical teaching as he understood it. As Regius Professor of Greek (1855 to 1866) he rendered valuable service. Another name, that of Dr. Ingram, is inseparably linked with the history of our Classical revival. He, having been first a University Scholar in Classics, was elected to Fellowship on Mathematics as his main subject, and so distinguished himself then and subsequently as to win high praise from the great mathematician McCullagh. We need do no more than mention the services Dr. Ingram has since rendered to Classical learning, both in pure Scholarship and in Comparative Grammar and Philology. His contributions to Political Economy and Social Philosophy also are well known. Taken all round he is the most accomplished man now connected with Dublin University. His lectures are remembered with gratitude by many in all parts of the world, who may be said to owe their intellectual birth to his influence.

It was not until about 1856 that the Fellowship Course began to be thoroughly reconsidered, and arrangements made for a really efficient Examination in Classics, and it was not until 1863 that a Fellowship was obtained by a candidate who had not taken up Mathematics. In that year, Thomas E. Webb obtained a Fellowship on Classics and Philosophy. But in 1859, though elected on a course which included Mathematics, William Hugh Ferrar took a part by no means insignificant in the incipient Classical revival. During his short tenure of Fellowship (he died in 1871) he was appointed Professor of Latin, a new Chair, and brought out the first volume of a Comparative Grammar of Sanskrit, Greek and Latin, a work of much promise. Dr. Webb resigned in 1871, but retained his Chair of Civil Law. His publications are chiefly philosophical, but he has brought out some brilliant translations in English verse. He will however probably be best known by his translation of *Faust*. The year 1864 gave to Trinity College John Pentland Mahaffy, author of *Twelve Lectures on Primitive Civilisations*; *Essay on the Social Development of the Greeks*; *Greek Social Life from Homer to Menander*; *Old Greek Life* (History Primer, J. R. Green's Series); *Rambles and Studies in Greece*; *Euripides* (in J. R. Green's Classical Authors); *History of Greek Classical Literature*; *Hippolytus of Euripides* (edited by Professor Mahaffy and Mr. Bury); *Duruy's History of the Romans* (edited); *Alexander's Empire*. We pass to 1867, when Arthur Palmer was elected. His election may be said to have inaugurated the triumph of pure Scholarship in Dublin University. Indeed, it may be added that the Board of Trinity College (still composed of the Mathematician class already described) were so alarmed for their favourite study by the election of Mr. Palmer, and the year after, of Robert Y. Tyrrell, that they actually altered the scale of marks so as to handicap Classics in the competition with Mathematics. Mr. Palmer has published editions of the *Heroides* of Ovid, the *Elegies* of Propertius, and the *Satires* of Horace. His contributions to *Hermathena* are numerous and valuable, and marked by a singular felicity in conjectural emendations of doubtful pas-

sages, especially in the text of Plautus and of Aristophanes. He became Professor of Latin in 1880, having up to that time been a College Tutor.

Mr. Tyrrell, who was elected in the year following Mr. Palmer, soon obtained the chair of Latin, having been elected on Ferrar's death in 1871. In 1880 he became Regius Professor of Greek, in succession to Dr. Ingram, who had been appointed a Senior Tutor. He has edited the *Bacchae* and the *Troades*, and translated the *Acharnians* into English verse; he has published an edition of the *Miles Gloriosus*, and is engaged upon the *Letters of Cicero*, of which two volumes have already appeared. He edited the volume of *Dublin Translations*, and also contributed largely to it.

We have already mentioned the retrograde step taken by the Board in their anti-Classical panic at the elections of Palmer and Tyrrell. A reaction followed in favour of Mathematical candidates, and out of the twelve years from 1868 to 1880 there were six in which no Fellowship was vacant. In 1880 occurred the election of a man in many ways the most remarkable among the Fellows of Trinity College, Dublin. This is Thomas Maguire, the first Roman Catholic Scholar and (at present) the only R.C. Fellow. Owing to the religious restriction, he was ineligible for Scholarship until 1855, when special Scholarships were created, open to Roman Catholics and Dissenters. The 'Foundation' Scholarships were still limited to members of the Church of Ireland, and continued so till 'Fawcett's Act,' in 1873, which threw open all the endowments of the College. Maguire had actually taken his B.A. degree before he went in for Scholarship. He practised at the Bar for a short time in London, but soon returned to Dublin and became a private teacher. During this period he published his essays on the *Platonic Idea* and the *Platonic Ethics*. In 1869 he was appointed Professor of Latin at Queen's College, Galway. Immediately upon the passing of Fawcett's Act in 1873 he resolved to become a candidate for Trinity College Fellowship, and he was successful in 1880, being then in the fiftieth year of his age. It should be noted that between 1873 and 1877, and again in 1878, there were no vacancies. Dr. Maguire was appointed in 1882 to the Chair of Moral Philosophy. He is a profound metaphysician as well as a brilliant scholar, and there is probably no man now living so thoroughly versed in Platonic literature.

Mr. Louis Claude Purser, who was elected in 1881, is the first Fellow who was wholly trained in the new Dublin Classical School, the rise and progress of which we have described. He has rendered valuable services as a Lecturer and Examiner. His original work so far has chiefly been that of collaborator with Mr. Tyrrell in the second volume of Cicero's letters, and he continues to take part in the forthcoming portions of the work. He is also contributing to Smith's *Dictionary of Antiquities*.

Mr. John Bagnell Bury (elected 1885), has given promise of good work. He is mentioned in the April number of the *Review*, as a contributor to *Bezenbergers Beiträge*. Mr. Alexander Charles O'Sullivan, the present junior (elected 1886) is the first Fellow since W. H. Ferrar who took up both Mathematics and Classics in his Fellowship course. This ends the list of the *personnel* as it stands. In future numbers we hope to say something of men who have gone out from Trinity College, Dublin, to other Colleges and Universities in Ireland and elsewhere; besides giving a sketch of the working of the Classical schools throughout Ireland.—E. S. R.

IN reference to a remark in the Cambridge Intelligence for April, Mr. J. G. Frazer writes to say that his translation of Pausanias will certainly not appear this year.

REPORTS.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

MR. CECIL SMITH has left England for a tour of four months in the East, proceeding first to Bombay. It is requested that during his absence communications for the archaeological portion of this Review may be addressed to Mr. Cecil Torr at 19, Old Buildings, Lincoln's Inn.

Sidon.—The *Times* on Wednesday, March 30, and Thursday, April 7, printed letters from the Rev. W. K. Eddy, American missionary, incoherently reporting the discovery of an important tomb about a mile to the north-east of Sidon. There is a shaft thirty feet square and forty feet deep, giving access to four chambers on its four sides. In these were found nine sarcophagi, described as of marble, sculptured and painted, and Greek in workmanship. And below the pavement at the base of the shaft were found sixteen sarcophagi, described as Phœnician or Egyptian in type. Beshara Effendi was at Sidon preparing to move the sarcophagi to Constantinople. A protest against this removal was added.—Last year glowing accounts came from Sidon of a newly-discovered sarcophagus with Athene and Marsyas in relief: but photographs shewed that it was merely of average Græco-Roman work. It is still for sale. The museum at Constantinople is not to be despised. It contains an interesting collection: and, under Hamdi Bey's direction, it is at least as well ordered as the museums at Athens. A catalogue by M. Salomon Reinach is in progress.—CECIL TORR.

Various.—A collection of coins belonging or relating to Palestine from 143 B.C. to 135 A.D. is comprised in the Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition at the Albert Hall.

Archæological articles in English journals.—*Nineteenth Century*, April: Demeter and the Pig, by Mr. Andrew Lang.—*Saturday Review*, April 9: Easter in Samos.—*Times*, April 9: Excavations at Orvieto.—*Athenæum*, March 26 and April 9: News from Athens.

Acquisitions to British Museum, continued from page 82.

GENERAL ACQUISITIONS.

Marbles.

Head and forehead of horse found at Civita Lavinia (ancient Lanuvium) in course of excavations carried on there by Sir J. Savile Lumley; it appears to have formed part of a chariot group with four horses: spirited Græco-Roman work. *Archæologia*, xlix. pt. 2, p. 367.

Portrait head of Marcus Brutus as a young man; from Rome.

Portrait head of the younger Drusus; from Kyrenia, Cyprus.

Torso of Cupid bending bow: Græco-Roman work.

Stele of fourth century Athenian work, with relief representing a sepulchral vase (amphora) supported by a winged sphinx which faces the spectator, and whose body is heraldically repeated on either side. On the vase is sculptured in relief a parting scene between two warriors whose names are inscribed beside them, Ἀρχιάδης Ἀγνούσιος and Πολεμόνικος Ἀθμωνεύς. Boeckh (1828), in publishing this inscription, said that the stele was then the property of Lord Guilford. *C. i.* No. 552.

Inscriptions.

Two marble fragments of Greek inscriptions, one of which appears to be part of a subscription list containing a curious siglum; from Erythrae.

Marble pestle in the form of a bent leg; the lower part, forming the thigh, encircled with an engraved wreath and inscribed Ροδοκλ...as; from Rhodes.

Fragment of stucco containing part of five lines of a painted inscription in late Greek characters; apparently a list of names; from Rhodes.

Cast of a Latin inscription found at Mactaris in Africa; *Eph. Epig.* v. 279.

Bronzes.

Right leg from a colossal bronze statue, broken away somewhat above the knee; the toes and part of the foot wanting. It is encased in a greave ornamented at the knee with a Gorgoneion of archaic type. The figure to which this leg belonged seems to have been that of an armed warrior standing with his weight supported on the left leg and with his right leg drawn back, with the toes lightly resting on the ground. It belongs to the best period of Greek art, and is specially interesting on account of the scarcity of fine works in bronze of that period which have come down to us. Found in 1859 in Magna Graecia: see Lenormant, *La Grande Grèce*, I. p. 90: *Hellenic Journal*, vii. pl. lxix.

Several fragments of drapery and apparently also of armour which seem to have belonged to the same statue as the preceding.

Statuette of a draped female figure holding an apple (?); 3 in. high; from Tell Mogdân in Delta.

Four Bronze oinochoae; from Galaxidi near Delphi.

Stamp engraved with rude patterns; from Smyrna.

Stamp, with name of M. Aur. Cocceius; from Malta.

Five bronze pins and needles, various; found in the Tiber.

Terra-cottas.

A series of fragments of painted sarcophagi, from Klazomenæ, with archaic designs like those of the black-figured vases; the subjects represented are as follows:—

a. Two horsemen with dogs; *Hellenic Journal*, iv. p. 19, fig. 14.

b. Armed warriors in combat, on either side a horseman; *ibid.* pl. xxxi.

c. Grotesque satyr; above, a band with two birds; *ibid.* p. 21, fig. 15.

d. Nude female figure holding a bird in each hand, flanked by two dogs and two colossal cocks, *ibid.* p. 20.

e. f. Two fragments with Maeander pattern in brown on drab.

Mask of a satyr; a very interesting specimen, of thick red terra-cotta, pierced at nostrils and also with double string holes beside each ear and over the forehead for attachment. The type is that of the sixth century, so-called 'Chalcidian' satyr, with long carefully plaited beard, horse's ears, squat nose, and eyes and bushy eyebrows turned upward (cf. *Hellenic Journal*, vi. p. 190); from Samos.

Boat-shaped vessel with two compartments, possibly intended to contain pigments; from Samos.

Vase in form of a camel kneeling, with panniers between which is the mouth of the vase; in the left pannier is tied a cock and a boar's head; in the right a pair of water bottles.

Vases.

Bowl of drab ware with brown linear ornaments, exactly similar to *Myk. Vas.* No. 80; said to have been found at Saqqara, Egypt.

Etruscan cup of black ware (same form as *Berlin Vase Catalogue*, No. 150, but without stem), with incised design and satyric mask in relief.

Lower part of vase in form of an archaic female bust, with flutes; from Rhodes.

Small black askos with two palmettes in red.

Small bowl of Samian ware, stamped on side *Κλευβούλου*; from Alexandria.

Gems.

Scaraboid, black stone, with very rude intaglio; a man holding two horses by their heads; on each horse's back stands a diminutive figure.

Scaraboid, steatite; the convex side carved in form of a negro's head; on under surface a geometric pattern.

Green jasper scarab; combat of man and lion, above, a winged disk.

Red jasper scarab; a lion reclining, above, a flying bird; all from Tyre.

Chalcedony cone; on base intaglio, two eagles devouring a hare; from Kara Hissar.

Chalcedony intaglio; a girl seated, holding a scroll; before her is a cippus inscribed *ἔπος*, on which is a lyre; from Beresford-Hope Collection. Raspe 3479. Figured and described by A. S. Murray, *the New Amphion* (Edinburgh, 1886), p. 28.

Greenstone intaglio; youth standing beside colossal horse.

Chalcedony intaglio; bust of Perseus with winged cap and harpè.

Sard intaglio; a lion.

Sard intaglio; Fortuna, with cornucopia, rudder and staff.

Red jasper intaglio; Hekaté with torches.

Impression in burnt clay from a fine intaglio representing Aphrodité (?), nude to waist, leaning against a column on which is a tripod.

Gold.

A pair of earrings, formed of twisted gold wire and gold plate with granulated patterns; from Bubastis.

A pair of earrings with lotus pendants; from Bubastis.

Lead.

Relief, two goats springing to right: from Beyrût.

Model of a biga; from Smyrna.

Porcelain.

Fragment of plaque with relief in a panel of two sphinxes confronted, between them a palmtree; above *Σαπάρη*; from Alexandria.

Ivory.

Statuette of a draped female figure leaning on a cippus; on her left shoulder an infant (Eros?) has knelt; the upper part of his figure is broken away; from Bubastis. This figure is precisely the same type as the Venus which occurs on the Roman coins of the Republic; see e.g. the coin of the Cordia Gens (Cohen, *Monnaies de la Rep. Rom.* pl. xiv.), where she holds a pair of scales and a sceptre.

Glass.

Aryballos, with vertical stripes of three colours; similar to the terra-cotta aryballi with this form of decoration found e.g. in Rhodes; from Samos.

Amber.

A necklace of fifty-three beads of various shapes; from Cumæ.

DEPARTMENT OF BRITISH AND MEDIAEVAL
ANTIQUITIES.

A series of late rough bowls of Roman glass, from Amiens, engraved with designs, including a head of Perseus and a combat.

Roman glass from Tyre.

Alex. Nesbitt's entire collection of antique glass fragments, including a large variety of specimens of *opus sectile*.

A large red terra-cotta amphora, and a black glazed pot of ribbed ware, with white decorations, above which is painted DAVITA; found together at Old Ford.

DEPARTMENT OF COINS.

The most important acquisition was a selection from the collection of the late Mr. Whittall of Smyrna of ninety specimens from a collection of early electrum coins of the Ionian coast struck between the sixth and fifth centuries, including many types quite new and unpublished; these will shortly be published by Mr. Barclay V. Head in the *Numismatic Chronicle*. Among them is included a fifth century stater of Cyzicus with *obv.* upper part of figure of Gaia rising from soil holding the infant Erichthonios; below, a tunny fish: *rev.* quadripartite incuse square of 'millsail' pattern. If we combine this group with the Kekrops on another Cyzicene stater of the same period (*British Museum Guide to Coins*, x. 14), we have nearly complete the same treatment of this subject which occurs on the Berlin terra-cotta (*Arch. Zeitung N. F.* v. Taf. 63). It seems likely that some such group as this may have existed at Cyzicus, suggesting to the artist the types of these two coins.

A number of new varieties of the tetradrachms of Alexander the Great.

A magnificent silver tetradrachm of Amphipolis.

The series of coins noticed in *Naukratis*, pp. 63-69, and published in the *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1886, pl. 1.

CECIL SMITH.

DEPARTMENT OF GREEK AND ROMAN ANTIQUITIES,
1887.

Etruscan Art.—The trustees have acquired the contents of an Etruscan tomb, of exceptional interest, which was recently discovered at Chiusi. An account of the find has been published in the *Mittheilungen (Römische Abtheilung)* vol. i. p. 217. The most important object is a large terra-cotta sarcophagus of unusual merit. The front of the sarcophagus itself is adorned with pilasters dividing the ground into panels, and on each panel is a large rosette. On the lid is the life-size figure of a woman, whose name is recorded in an inscription on the face of the sarcophagus:—

SEIANTI · ΘΑΝΥΝΙΑ · ΤΛΕΣΝΑΣΑ.

Seianti Thanunia, wife of Tlesna.

In the whole of the treatment, the figure is very similar to one in the Archaeological Museum at Florence, also representing a Seianti, *Mon. dell. Inst.* xi. tav. i. The woman is represented as reclining, with her left elbow resting on a pillow. The left hand holds a mirror in its open case, whilst the right hand draws back the *peplos* from the head; she wears a diadem and earrings painted to imitate gold and amber; and she has two armlets (one in the form of coiled snakes), a necklace and six rings, in some instances painted as if set with sards. The hair, eyebrows, eyelashes, and eyeballs, are painted brownish purple, and there is a broad stripe of the same colour round the edges of her drapery. The flesh is of a warm tint, and there are also remains of blue and other colours. Though not exactly beautiful, this work must raise Etruscan sculpture in the opinion of those who judge it by the examples commonly seen. The figure has a certain dignity; though somewhat

realistic, it is not repulsively so, and the face (especially when seen in profile from the right) is not unpleasing. The sarcophagus contained a skeleton, doubtless that of Seianti herself. Suspended from the walls of the tomb were various objects of silver and silver gilt. These comprise a silver vase, six inches high, the body in the form of an ostrich egg; a silver vase of Aryballos form, surrounded by a band of gilding, on which is punctuated a wave pattern; a silver box with lid, and a silver mirror both with the same band of gilding and wave pattern; and a silver strigil. The date of the sarcophagus must be very nearly the same as that of the companion work now at Florence: and the date of that can be inferred from coins discovered with it, *Milchhöfer, Annali dell. Inst.* 1879, p. 88. The date is thus ascertained to be the first half of the second century B.C.—A. H. SMITH.

DEPARTMENT OF ORIENTAL ANTIQUITIES, 1887.

Ptolemaic Inscription.—Syenite red granite: about nine feet high; one foot thick; remaining width, one foot eight inches, with fully two feet missing on left and something less on right. Figures of kings and gods in relief at top. First line, in large letters, names Philometor. Then follow decrees and epistles relating to worship at Elephantine. Section 1,

ll. 2–14, dated in the second year in the (Egyptian) month Mesori, mentions Elephantine and the holy spring of the Nile, Xome . . . by name, also the god Neilos and the goddess Hera. Section 2, ll. 15–25, dated in the second year in the (Macedonian) month Hyperberetaios, is addressed to the priests at Elephantine, and mentions the temple of Chnoub (Khnum) and the country of the Æthiopians, also the Epiphaneis and Eupator. Section 3, ll. 26–35, is addressed to Phommouti, and contains two epistles to the priests at Elephantine; the first, dated in the second year in the month Hyperberetaios, mentioning Eupator and the Philometores: the second, dated in the second year on the 3rd of the (Macedonian) month Daisios and on the 4th of the (Egyptian) month Pharmouthi, mentioning the Philometores and Philopator (νέος), also the temple of Chnoub. Section 4, ll. 36–38, is addressed to Hermocrates. Section 5, ll. 39–50, is addressed to the Philometores Soteris, and mentions the island called Psoan, also Philanthropos and the Nicephoroe and Aionobioe. Section 6, ll. 51–66, is addressed to Cleopatra (the niece and wife of Ptolemy VII. Euergetes II.) and others, and seems of the same purport as the rest. The lower part of the slab is much defaced; and section 7, ll. 67–71, and section 8, ll. 72–75, are almost illegible.—CECIL TORR.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Zeitschrift für das Gymnasial-Wesen, Feb. 1887. W. Schrader discusses proposals for University reform in Germany and Russia.—G. Brornig suggests improved rules for the gender and declension of nouns in elementary Latin Grammar.—A. Jacobson praises the new edition of H. Cremer's *Biblisch-theologisches Wörterbuch der neutestamentlichen Gräcität*—Andresen continues his *Jahresbericht* of Tacitus. The following seem most worth notice: Johannes Müller, *Annals* ad. crit. 'chiefly follows Halm's latest text, not happy in emendations, gives many illustrations from the elder Pliny.' Pfütz, *Ann.* (bks. iii–xvi) 'text and notes equally rash.' K. Nipperdey *Ann.* (i–vi) ed. Andresen, 'the text more conservative than in the former edition, many additions to the commentary.' H. Ulbrich, *Der litterarische Streit über Tacitus Agricola*, 'a clear and impartial account of the controversy waged on this subject from the beginning of the century.' Th. Mommsen, *Die Örtlichkeit der Varusschlacht*, 'commands general assent.' R. Raffay, *Die Mémoires der Kaiserin Agrippina*, 'ingenious but too fanciful.' W. Thompson Watkin, *Roman forces in Britain* (*Archæol. Journal*, xli pp. 244–271) 'convicts Hübner of errors by giving a complete list of all the troops which can be proved to have served in Britain.' List of lately published inscriptions illustrating Tacitus. G. Schoenfeld, *De Taciti studiis Sallustianis*, 'written in bad Latin, but not without value.' O. Binde, *De Taciti Dialogo quaestiones criticae*, 'succeeds in pointing out faults in Baehrens' text.' Andresen seems occasionally to indulge in a little quiet irony as when he puts side by side such judgments as the following of Hochart's *études sur la vie de Sénèque*, 'scharfsinnig und umsichtig' (*Athenaeum*) 'ein Rettungsversuch der schlimmsten Sorte, oberflächlich und sentimental, nirgends überzeugend' (*Lit. Centralbl.*)

Theologisch Tijdschrift, xxi. 1, January 1887:—The only article which concerns us is by J. J. Prins on the treatment of the Epistle to the Galatians by Pierson and Naber in their *Verisimilia*. These

authors (or rather Pierson only according to Dr. Prins) make the Epistle consist of fragments, 'quae variam produnt originem mirisque modis commixta et confusa sunt.' Dr. Prins examines severally the fifteen discrepancies which they profess to have discovered, and endeavours to show that they are all unreal. He concludes that, like Kuenen, he would place a 'large note of interrogation' after the *Verisimilia* of his Amsterdam colleagues.

Zeitschrift für Numismatik (Berlin), vol. xiv. 1887, Parts 3 and 4.

'On Ancient Numismatics,' by W. Drexler. Notes on various Greek Coins. 'On the titles borne by the Flavian emperors,' by B. Pick. Concluded from vol. xiii. This part deals with the evidence of Greek, Imperial, and Roman coins on the subject. Minor contributions:—'On the Cock as an attribute of Mên,' by W. Drexler; 'On the Aera of Cleopatra.'

Annuaire de la Société française de Numismatique (Paris), 1887. Jan.—Feb.

'Second Letter to M. Lenormant,' by M. Revillout. On the relations of gold, silver, and copper in Egypt under the Ptolemies.

The new part of the *Revue Egyptologique* (4 ann. nos. iii. iv.) is of much interest to classical scholars. The late Vicomte de Rougé's paper on inscriptions from the Apis tombs is valuable as illustrating Herodotus, and throws light on the history of the Ptolemies. M. Jacques de Rougé edits this memoir and continues his critical edition of the Poem of Pentaur, an essay essential to students of Homeric geography and the early history of Asia Minor. Prof. Revillout's opening lecture on Egyptian law is important in illustration of Diod. Sic., much more in its bearing on Roman law. His paper on Nubian history though in part relating to times beyond our limit is full of new historical matter. The part also contains two series of metrological documents, Greek and Greek and demotic (bilingual), and a new Greek inscription of the reign of Ptolemy Philometor from Ptolemais in the Thebaid.—P.

Blätter für das Bayer. Gymnasialschulwesen redigiert von Adolf Roemer. München, J. Lindauer. Vol. xxiii Heft 1. L. Dittmeyer, Spuriousness of Aristot. hist. an. ix.—Reviews by G. Landgraf of (1) Cic. Tusc. with Germ. notes by L. W. Hasper. I (b. I-II) 1883. pp. 114. II (b. III-V) 1885. pp. 159. 8vo. Gotha, Perthes. (2) Quaestiones Tullianae. Pars prima de Ciceronis epistulis. Scripsit C. A. Lehmann, Prag (Leipzig) 1886. Tempsky (Freytag) pp. VIII, 136. Lehmann, known as a student of Cicero, by articles in the *Hermes* and in the *Berlin Jahrbuch der Philol. Vereins*, is preparing an edition of Cicero's letters, and here proposes many specious emendations; in many places he defends the vulgate successfully, especially against Wesenberg. (3) Q. Curtius with German notes by Th. Vogel. Vol. I (b. III-V). Third ed. 1885. pp. 229. Leipzig, Teubner (highly praised, esp. the *Syntax Curtiana*). Review by Bernhard Sefp of Festi brevium rerum gestarum populi Romani, edidit Carolus Wagener. Prag (Leipzig), Tempsky (Freytag). pp. xiv, 23. 50 Pf.—Review by Weeklein of (1) Aristophanis deperditarum comœdiarum fragmenta. Auxit, novo ordine digessit, recensuit et annotatione partim aliorum selecta instruxit Fredericus H. M. Blaydes. Halle, Waisenhaus. 1885. p. xiv. 491. 8vo. (2) Aristophanis comici quae supersunt opera. Recensuit Fredericus H. M. Blaydes. Vol. I. Undecim fabulas superstites continens. pp. xc, 528. Vol. II. Fragmenta annotatione partim aliorum selecta instructa continens. pp. xiv, 628. Halle, Waisenhaus. 1886. 8vo. ('Though many objections may be raised, yet the good greatly predominates; ever and anon we come across an excellent remark or a brilliant emendation . . . The edition of Blaydes will take, I do not care to say an epoch-making, but at any rate a very important place in the literature of Aristophanes').—Review by M. Rottmänner of P. Willems, Les élections municipales à Pompéi. Bruxelles, Hayez; Paris, Thorin. 1886. pp. 142. 8vo. (Most of the wall-inscriptions at Pompéi are recommendations of candidates for election; Willems counts 590 for the year of the destruction of the city, A.D. 79).—Review by H. Zimmerer of Generalkarte des Königreichs Griechenland, im Masstabe 1: 300,000 der Natur. Nach Berichtigungsdaten des k. griech. Oberstlieutenants J. Kokides und revidiert von Prof. Dr. H. Kiepert. Bearbeitet und herausgegeben vom k. k. Militärgeographischen Institute in Wien. 1885 (thirteen sheets, price 70 kr. each. The review names other late publications on Greek geography, e.g. the 'epoch-making' work 'Die physikalische Geographie von Griechenland von Neumann-Partsch, Breslau 1885').

The late numbers of the *Zeitschrift* of the *Deutsche Morgenländ. Gesellsch.* (Band xiv. Heft 1-3) contain several articles bearing on classical literature. Dr. Gildemeister shows that Moses of Khoren in his account of the siege of Tigranocerta by Sapor II. has adopted rather than adapted the text of Alexander's capture of Thebes in the Pseudo-Kallisthenes. This discovery raises a curious question as to the date of the Armenian translation of the romance. Eugen Wilhelm on *Königthum und Priesterthum im alten Iran*, illustrates Greek writers on his subject from Persian sources. Dr. M. Klamroth contributes a careful paper on the citations of Greek authors by the Arab chronicler El-Yakubi dealing first with Hippocrates. It is most important that scholars should be alive to the information to be obtained from Arab and other Oriental sources as to Greek texts, especially those of the philosophers and physicians. Dr. Kuhnert contributes a paper on *Midas in Greek Legend and Art*.—P.

THE last number of the *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique* (tome 6, fasc. 2) begins with an article by M. Bréal occasioned by the publication of the second volume of M. Zvetaielf's *Inscriptiones Mediae Dialecticae*. M. Bréal chiefly discusses the meaning of the words HERENTATEI HERVKINAI on an inscription found at Herculaneum, which he would translate by 'decreto Herculensium.' The rest of the number is mainly occupied with notes on various etymological points by MM. Bréal, Havet, and Victor Henry. The most interesting article is one by M. Victor Henry, in which he deals with the Latin case terminations containing *b* (*-bus*, *-bi*, *-bis*). His conclusion is that in no case does the existing termination directly represent the Indo-European original, the exact form being everywhere the result of analogy rather than strict phonetic law. M. Havet discusses the Latin ablatives in *-ē*, and holds that they originate from a confusion between the ablative proper of consonantal stems (*-id*, *-ed*) and the locative (*-i*). Among the individual words discussed we may mention as specially interesting: *sē*, *sēd*—*τιθαιβώσσω*, *faber*—*οιομαι οίμαι*—*necesse*—*Φερώσιος* vetare—*victima*—*hostire*, and the *g* in *ne-g-otium*, *ne-g-legens*, *ne-g-o*, which M. Havet identifies with the Greek *γε*. M. de Saussure contributes a more complete statement than has yet appeared of the form taken by the hard velar guttural in Greek after a *v*. M. Philippe Berger has an article on Camillus (Casmillus. Greek, *Κάμιλλος*, *Κάσμυλος*, *Καδμῖλος*) in which he recognises the Phoenician *Kadm-El*—'he that is in the presence of God.' He would connect *Kādmos*, an abbreviated form, as in Semel-Baal, which appears without the last element in Semele.

Wochenschrift für Klassische Philologie, edited by G. ANDRESEN and H. HELLER (Hirschfelder having retired)—No. 1. (1 Jan. 1887): W. Soltan, *Prolegomena zu einer römischen Chronologie* (G. Phoaret), Matzat, Holzappel, Soltan tread too closely on one another's heels.—W. Christ, *Aristotelis Metaphysica* (F. Susemihl), gives a new and careful collation of the two oldest MSS. A^b and E, and concludes that they are from independent sources, E being slightly the less valuable, and that all the later MSS. are derived from one or other of them. The contributions of other scholars, the Reviewer, Bonitz, Jackson and others, have not been sufficiently weighed and noticed.—G. Helmreich, *Galeni de utilitate partium liber quartus* (H. Marquardt), good.—E. Popp, *de Ciceronis de officiis librorum codice Palatino 1531* (Th. Schiehe), the MS. is not of much value for settling the text.

No. 2 (12 Jan.): H. Schütz, *Sophokleische Studien I, Antigone* (A. Oldenberg) contains some excellent and simple conjectures, but chiefly devoted to defence of MS. readings.—F. Meister, *Quintilian I. O. i.-vi.* (M. Kiderlin), a decided advance on Halm's text, and gives MS. Bn. its proper weight. Reviewer discusses a number of passages in books 3 and 4.

No 3 (19 Jan.): P. Bersu, *Die Gutturalen u. ihre Verbindung mit u. in Lateinischen* (H. Schweizer Sidler) a long and favourable review.—R. Beck, *Zu Ciceros Rede in Clodium et Curionem* (Th. Stangl) good.—J. Obermeier *der Sprachgebrauch des Lucanus* (J. H. Schmalz) enables reviewer in some points to correct and supplement his syntax in Müller's Handbuch.

No. 4 (26 Jan.): S. Lederer, *eine neue Handschrift v. Arrians Anabasis* (C. R. Grundmann), the MS. is of the 15th cent., and not of much value.—Piderit *Cicero de Oratore Lib I.* 6th edition by O. Harnecker (Th. Stangl). Reviewer communicates some new MS. readings which he recommends.

No. 5 (2 Feb.): J. Zvetaieff, *Inscriptiones Italiae mediae dialecticae: Inscript. It. inferioris dialect.* (W. Deecke, continued from No. 4)—P. Cauer, *Odyssæ* i.-xii. (A. Gemoll), interesting for scholars, but not suitable, as it is designed, for schools.—A. Engelbrecht, *Claudiani Mamerti opera* (Deutsch), the best MS. is curiously the latest Cod. M. (Lipsiensis) which belongs to end of 11th cent. Hardly anything has been done for C. M. since 1655, and this successful edition of a writer who had great influence on the speculation of the Middle Ages is therefore very welcome.

No. 6 (9 Feb.): M. Wohlrab *Platons Phædon* 2nd edit. (C. Shielitz), a long review of the alterations of the new edition.—P. Schwenke, *Hadardus Cicero-Excerpte* (Stangl), clear and comprehensive account of the readings preserved in Hadard's autograph.—W. Gillischewski, *Scidae Horatianae* (G. Faltn), unfavourable.—C. Peter, *griechische Zeittafeln* 6th edition (Bahn), might have distinguished the three stages in the evolution of the Lyeurgæan constitution.

No. 7 (16 Feb.): R. Westphal *Griechische Harmonik* 3rd edition (K. v. Jan.), hostile and polemical review: this edition no advance on the second.—E. Abel *Orphica* (Heidenhain), "much good material amassed, little judgment shown."—Liers, *Geschichtsschreibung des Dionys v. Hal.*, not convincing.—F. Stolz, *Latin. Laut u. Formelchre* (H. Schweiger-Sidler), not final but indispensable.—Olsufieff, *Juvenal von Fet* (A. Kleinschmidt), deserves notice.—H. Wetzel, *latein. synonymik* (Tegge), brief, clear and praiseworthy.

No. 8 (23 Feb.): *Inscriptiones Ponti Euxini I. et Scythiae Albae etc.*, ed. B. Latyshev (L. Büchner), two-thirds of these inscriptions not to be found in C. I. G.; indispensable for the topography and antiquities of the north coast of the Black Sea.—R. Westphal, *Griechische Harmonik* concluded.—Cicero's *Reden von Halm*—Laubmann 12th edition, (H. Nohl), a long list of corrections and suggestions.

No. 9 (2 March): G. Curtius *Kleine Schriften* (O. Immisch), after discussing the Junggrammatiker, declares that a Graeco-Italic period as assumed by Curtius and Mommsen cannot yet be said to have been disproved.—H. R. Goehler *de Matris Magnae cultu* (L. Friedländer), worthless.—A. Holder *Herodotus* (W. Gemoll), many misprints, treatment of dialect unsatisfactory, critically weak—in fine unscientific.—M. Wellmann *de Istro Callimachio* (-k) discerning and comprehensive investigation as to the Ἀτθίδων συναγωγή of Istros.—E. Kurz *Maximus Planudes* a modest and praiseworthy little edition of this collection of proverbs.

No. 10 (9 March): G. Curtius *Kleine Schriften* concluded.—F. Johansson *de derivatis verbis contractis linguae Graecae* (H. v. d. Pfordten), familiar with the latest Indogermanic philology the author shows that derivatives in *āo*, *ēo*, *ōo*, are as original as those in *āo*, *ēo* and *ōo*.—F. Hiller de Gaertringen *de graecorum fabulis ad Thraces pertinentibus* (M. Wellmann) a successful attempt to disengage history out of myth.—R. Menge u. S. Preuss *Lex. Caesarianum* II. (E. Wolff), a searching but favourable review: the book

is an apparatus criticus in lexic formam redactus.—G. Hatz *Zur Hendiadys in Ciceros Reden* (Th. Stange), treats of the nature and extent of so called Hendiadys in Cicero.

Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie iv. i.

(Pp. i-13) *Die Dissimilation der littera canina* (E. Wölfflin). It is well known that the Latins disliked two or three consecutive syllables containing 'r.' This paper examines the limits of the dislike, which appears more strongly in popular than in literary Latin, and the ways in which the obnoxious sounds were avoided. (Compare *Archiv* iii. 539 and Seelmann's *Aussprache* 328f.). Among other details, the words *flagrare* (burn), *fragrare* (smell) and *fraglare*=*flagrare* kept its form and sense till the African Latin appeared, when it became *fraglare*. On p. 10 it is suggested that infinitives like *amarier* passed out of use in consequence of the double r—(pp. 19-43). *Die Natur im Sprichwort* (A. Otto), a collection of Latin proverbs drawn from nature. Those taken from the vegetable kingdom are to follow in a special article (Cp. *Archiv* iii. 59, 207, 388).—(p. 43) *Medianus* (C. Hofmann) the German *Meiden* comes from this and not from the gothic maithms—(pp. 44-51) *Zu Dracontius* (K. Rossberg). Four notes: (1) *Dracontius*, like his imitator *Corippus* (*Archiv* iii. 150, 284) used transitive verbs intransitively, viz. *crispere*, *frangere*, *iungere*, *incrygere*, *minuere*, *rumpere*, *serenare*, *solidare*, *temperare*. (2) Dr. uses *extare* not *stare* in the sense of *esse*. Ought we not to derive French *être*, Italian *stato* &c. from *extare*? (3) Dr. uses *expectare*=*spectare* e.g. 9.21. (4) The late Latin use of the present participles of intransitive verbs as past part. Incidentally some of Bahrens' conjectures are shown to be wrong—(p. 51) *Temere* (E. W.). *Sean temerē*, neut. from *temeris* (compare *temeriter*).—(pp. 52-67) *Usque mit Accusativ* (E. W.). A lexicographical article: *usque* with abl. of place whither p. 59. Justin's use of *usque* suggests that he was a Christian (p. 55)—(p. 67) *Vice versa* (E. W.)—(pp. 68-87) *Die Verba auf illare* (A. Funck). The principal words discussed are: *scintillo*, *stillo* and compounds, *ancillor*, *cavillor*, *furcillo*, *oscillo*, *sigillo*. (In considering the etymology of *cavillor* (p. 77), de Saussure's *κόβαλος* (*Voyelles* p. 106) or Nettle's *carco* might have been quoted.)—(pp. 88-100) *Penes* (P. Hirt). A lexicographical article with remarks by Wölfflin—(p. 100) *Dirigere litteras* (E. W.). Not a classical phrase—(pp. 101-108) *Abdico*—*Abhibeo* (E. W.) and (pp. 109-115) *abhinc* (H. Ploen) lexicographical articles—(pp. 116-136) *Vulgärlateinische substrate M.N.* (Gröber). The most interesting item is the conclusion (p. 127) that *moulon* &c. are derived from some foreign source, not from *mut(i)lonem as Diez says—(pp. 137-147) *Miscellen*. Hertz comments on *Archiv* iii. 355; Hauer explains *adductorium* as 'a curtain'; Havet thinks *coluber* borrowed from *χέλιδρος*; E. Wölfflin writes on hendiadys, and *ex toto in totum*; Keller discusses Cato. Plin. ep. 1, 5, 14, Melo=Nilus; &c. (pp. 148-168) *Litteratur*, reviews. The only English book noticed is Mr. Ellis' 'Phillipps Glossary.'

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

BOOKS PUBLISHED IN ENGLAND.

- Antiqua Mater*: a Study of Christian Origins. 12mo. 320 pp. London. Trübner. 7s. 6d.
- Augustine*. Three anti-Pelagian treatises: De spiritu et litera: De natura et gratia: De Gestis Pelagii. Translated into English with short preface and analysis to each treatise by the Rev. F. H. Woods, Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, and the Rev. J. D. Johnston, Fellow of Keble College, Oxford. Crown 8vo. 241 pp. Cloth. London. D. Nutt. 4s. 6d.
- Caesar*. De Bello Gallico commentarii. After the German of Kraner by the Rev. J. Bond and A. S. Walpole. 12mo. 490 pp. London. Macmillan. 6s.
- Cook* (A. M.) Macmillan's Latin Course. First Year. (Second, enlarged edition). 12mo. xiv. 341 pp. London. Macmillan. 3s. 6d.
- Gomme* (G. L.) Romano-British Remains. A classified collection of the chief contents of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1731-1868. Part I. 8vo. xxiv. 297 pp. Stock. 7s. 6d.

- Homer*. The Odyssey, done into English verse by William Morris, Author of the Earthly Paradise. In two volumes. Vol. I. (Books I.-XII.) Small 4to. VIII. 230 pp. London. Reeves and Turner. 12s. Vol. II. will be published in October.
- Sandys* (J. E.) An Easter Vacation in Greece, with lists of books on Greek Travel and Topography and Time-tables of Greek steamers and railways. 12mo. 175 pp. Map of Greece and Plan of Olympia. Cloth. London. Macmillan. 3s. 6d.
- Stedman* (A. M. M.) First Latin Lessons. 16mo. 94 pp. London. Bell. 1s.
- Testamentum Novum textus Stephanici 1554 cum variis lectionibus editionum Bezae, Elzevirii, Lachmanni, Tischendorfii, Tregellesii, Westcott-Hortii, Versionis Anglicanae. 8vo. 702 pp. London. Whittaker. 7s. 6d.

BOOKS PUBLISHED ON THE CONTINENT.

- Athenaci* Naucratis dipnosopistarum libri XV rec. G. Kaibel. Vol. II. Libri VI.—X. 12mo. iv. 498 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 4 Mk. 80.
- Borgaud* (Ch.) Histoire du Plébiscite dans l'Antiquité. 8vo. xv. 200 pp. Paris. Thorin.
- Chaignet* (A. E.) Essais de métrique grecque. Le vers iambique, précédé d'une introduction sur les principes généraux de la métrique grecque. 8vo. 282 pp. Paris. Vieweg. 6 fr.
- Cicero*. De natura deorum libri III. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von A. Goethe. 8vo. iv. 242 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 2 Mk. 40.
- Dinarchi* orationes III. ed Th. Thalheim. 8vo. viii. 52 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. 75 Pf.
- Dronckbahn* (O.) Lateinische Stilistik. 8vo. v. 128 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. 1 Mk. 60.
- Eudori* ars astronomica qualis in charta aegyptiaca superest, denuo edita a F. Blass. 4to. 25 pp. Kiel. Univ. Buchh. 1 Mk.
- Forcellini* (Aeg.) Totius latinitatis lexicon. Pars altera: V. de Vit. Onomasticon totius latinitatis. Dist. 30. 4to. Vol. III. pp. 713-752. Prati 1 fr. 50. This part completes Vol. III.
- Gerth* (B.) Griechisches Übungsbuch. 1. Cursus. 2. verb. Aufl. 8vo. viii. 175 pp. Leipzig. Winter. 1 Mk. 60.
- Handbuch der classischen Altertumswissenschaft in systematischer Darstellung herausgegeben von Dr. I. Müller. Vol. IV. pp. 483-931. Die römischen Altertümer: Schiller (H.) Staats- und Rechtsaltertümer, Kriegsaltertümer; Voigt (M.) Privataltertümer und Kulturgeschichte. Nördlingen. Beck. 5 Mk. 50.
- Herodoti* historiarum liber VIII. scholarum in usum ed. A. Holder. 12mo. 50 pp. Map. Leipzig. Freytag. 40 Pf.
- Herwerden* (H. van) Lucubrationes Sophocleae. 8vo. 83 pp. Utrecht. Beijers. 1 Mk. 70.
- Hg.* Ueber den Gebrauch von antequam und priusquam bei Caesar. 8vo. 7 pp. Tübingen. Fues. 20 Pf.
- John*. Zum Dialogus des Tacitus. 8vo. 32 pp. Tübingen. Fues. 60 Pf.
- Knoke* (Fr.) Die Kriegszüge des Germanicus in Deutschland. 8vo. 566 pp. 5 Maps. Berlin. Gaertner. 15 Mk.
- Liste de Drénour* (P. de) Les Gaulois Venètes, la Grande Brière, et le théâtre de la bataille navale de Brutus dans la Cornouaille. 4to. 10 pp. St. Brienc.
- Menge* (R.) et *Preuss* (S.) Lexicon Caesianum. Fasc. 3 (Fol. 257-384). Roy. 8vo. Leipzig. Teubner. 1 Mk. 60.
- Meyer* (E. H.) Indogermanische Mythen. II. Achilleis. 8vo. viii. 710 pp. Berlin. F. Dümmler. 14 Mk. (Vols. I. II. 19 Mk.).
- Mittheilungen aus der Sammlung der Papyrus des Erzherzog Rainer. I. Jahrg.: 3-4. Large 4to. pp. 53-130. Wiener Staatsdruckerei. Parts 1-4. 10s. Contains *inter alia*: Bickell, Das nichteanonische Evangelienfragment; Wessely, Literarische Fragmente aus El-Faijûm, I. Hesiod; Gomperz, Eine angebliche Tragödie des Euripides und die Kunstform des Dithyrambus.
- Nemesii Emeseni* libri *περι φύσεως ἀνθρώπου* versio latina. E. lib. MS. nunc primum edidit et apparatu critico instruit C. Holzinger. 8vo. xxxvii. 175 pp. Leipzig. Freytag. 6 Mk.
- Oberhammer* (E.) Akarnanien, Ambrakia, Amphilochien, Leukas im Altertum. 8vo. xviii. 330 pp. 2 maps. München. Ackermann. 10 Mk.
- Plauti* Comoediae rec. G. Loewe, G. Goetz, F. Schoell. Vol. III. fasc. II: Captivi, rec. Schoell. 8vo. xxiii. 138 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 4 Mk. (Vol. I.-III. 2. 45 Mk. 60).
- Polyaeni* Strategematon libri VIII. ex recensione E. Woelfflin. Iterum rec., excerpta Polyaeni e codice taticorum Florentino addidit, Leonis imperatoris strategemata e R. Schoellii apographo subiunxit I. Melber. 12mo. xxvi. 562 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 7 Mk. 50.
- Raceral*. Lugdunum: Légende de Clitophon: le Pseudo-Plutarque; fausse interprétation du mot Lug. 8vo. 20 pp. Lyon.
- Schepss* (G.) Die ältesten Evangelienhandschriften der Würzburger Universitätsbibliothek. 8vo. 38 pp. Würzburg. Stuber. 1 Mk. 20.
- Schnecider* (R.) Bodleiana: I. Additamenta ad volumen II. anecdotorum Oxoniensium Crameri. II. De Arcadii qui fertur codice Bodleiano disputatio. III. Excerpta ex libris Bodleianis. 8vo. 52 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 1 Mk. 60.
- Schrader* (O.) Ueber den Gedanken einer Kulturgeschichte der Indogermanen auf sprachwissenschaftlicher Grundlage. 8vo. 22 pp. Jena. Costenoble. 75 Pf.
- Sophokles*. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von G. Wolff. Teil I.: Aias, 4. Aufl. bearb. von L. Beltermann. 8vo. vi. 174 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 1 Mk. 20.
- Vergil's* Aeneide erklärt von K. Kappes. Heft I.: Aeneis I.-III. 4. verb. Aufl. 8vo. IV. 120 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 1 Mk. 20.
- Wcher* (B.) De *οὐλας* apud Aristotelem notione eiusque cognoscendae ratione. 8vo. 32 pp. Bonn. Behrendt. 1 Mk.
- Weidenbach* (P.) Aristoteles und die Schicksalstragödie. 4to. 15 pp. Dresden. 1 Mk.

The Classical Review

JUNE 1887.

JOHAN NICOLAI MADVIG.

(7 Aug. 1804—12 Dec. 1886.)

IN the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* for 1887, nos. 6 and 7 (5 and 12 Febr.), M. Cl. Gertz gives an account of his sometime teacher and late colleague, from which I take what follows:

Madvig was born in the town Svaneke in the island Bornholm. His father, grandfather, and great-grandfather, filled the office of 'Gerichtsschreiber' (magistrates' clerk). As early as his tenth year Johan N. helped his father to keep the books of the court. The familiarity with law thus early gained was turned to account both in his writings and in practical life.

In 1816 his father died, and in the next year by the help of friends he was sent to the grammar-school of Frederiksborg in Seeland. In 1820 he entered the University of Copenhagen, and in Jan. 1825 passed his philological examination with the testimony: *laudabilis unanimi consensu*. A month later appeared 'Gasparis Garatonii notae in Ciceronis orationes, ex edit. Neap. seorsum editae per quinque iuvenes Haunienses'; among the five were Madvig and his friends Elberling and R. Henrichsen. On the 15 July 1826 he defended for his master's degree his 'emendationes in Cic. libr. de legg. et acad.' Shortly after, when Prof. Thorlacius left Denmark for two years, Madvig was appointed his deputy. In 1828 he wrote 'epistola crit. ad Orellium de orat. Verriarum libris II extremis emendandis' and his doctor's dissertation 'de Q. Asconii . . . et aliorum veterum interpretum in Ciceronis orationes commentariis.' Though Thorlacius had returned, Madvig remained as Lector at the University, and on T's death was appointed Professor Eloquentiae (in the Latin language and literature) on 17 Nov. 1829. From 1826 to the end of 1879 he continued to teach in the University with an interval of three years (16 Nov. 1848—4 Dec. 1851),

NOS. V. & VI. VOL. I.

during which he was Minister of Worship. From 1832-48 he was also University Librarian, and from 1848-74 (with the same interval) Inspector of Education. In the Danish Academy of Science he was President from 1867 to his death. He was also an active politician, member of the Danish Parliament from 1848-74, and President of the Council (Reichsrat) from 1856-63. As Professor Eloquentiae he was required to write the University programmes, collected in his *Opuscula Academica* (1834, 1842). He was engaged on a second enlarged edition of these volumes at his death. In 1830 he published for the first time 'Ciceronis orationes sel. xii,' seven times reprinted with continual improvements (since 1876 containing only ten speeches). In the same year appeared Henrichsen's *Cic. de or.*, in which his friend had a large share. In 1835 followed the Cato and Laelius of Cicero; in 1839 Madvig's *opus magnum Cic. de fin.* (again 1869 and 1876). In 1840 appeared the first Danish, in 1843 the first German, edition of his *Latin Grammar*; in 1846 the first Danish, 1847 the first German, edition of his *Greek Syntax* (supplemental pamphlets 'Bemerkungen' u. s. w. accompanied each of the German grammars). The *Emendationes Livianae* appeared 1860 (sec. enlarged ed. 1877); the edition of *Livy*, in which Ussing had a hand, 1861-6 (bks. i-v now in the 3rd, xxi-xxv in the 4th ed.). The third great critical work 'Adversaria critica' appeared in 1871-73, and 1884. Contributions to reviews, chiefly Danish, were collected in 'Kleine philologische Schriften 1875' in a German version. In preparing this work Madvig so strained his already weak sight, that thenceforward he could scarcely read or write. He still continued to lecture, employing his two daughters and various young friends and students as

readers and secretaries. No important work, and that not only in classical philology,—escaped his attention; he read again many classical authors, and made acquaintance with others for the first time. For his last great work 'The Constitution and Administration of the Roman State' (1881–2, 2 vols) he had already laid the foundation in his lectures; but he went over the whole ground, including the *corpus inscriptionum*, anew.

He was indisputably the greatest classical scholar, that we have had in the Scandinavian north, and a place will be made for him among the greatest, who have won distinction in this science in any land, at any time.

Gertz pays a warm tribute to Madvig's geniality, high sense of honour, and love of truth; to his tact in estimating and classifying manuscript tradition; to the thoroughness and simplicity of his exegesis; to his clear insight into the life of ancient Greece and Rome; to his services as minister of state and inspector of schools. 'He was the hero of the whole Danish student-world, and to the last delighted to associate with them.'

In 1875 I had the great happiness of sitting next to Madvig at a dinner given by the University of Leyden to the guests at its tercentenary. I saw the first meeting between him and Cobet, and remembered the description given by the aged Gersdorf some ten years before, of the meeting between Friedrich Jacobs and his old correspondent Gottfried Hermann. Madvig had a singular grace and ease of manner. He seemed to feel that 'humane letters' had been freed from a stain, when I assured him that we in England were indignant with Ritschl for admitting into the Rheinisches Museum (1875, 91–117) a flippant¹ article by Lehrs, 'Adversarien über Madvig's Ad-

versarien und ihren Verfasser. Zur Abwehr geistloser Kritik in der klassischen Philologie.'

Cobet, in proposing Madvig's health as the acknowledged master of the critical art, added: 'but we will not make a pope of you; *pugnabimus tecum, contendemus tecum, eoque vehementius pugnabimus, quo te vehementius admiramur.*' Madvig began his reply thus. *Post Cobetum latine loqui vereor*; but soon passed from compliments to give some admirable advice to the students. I asked about his teachers; he said he was *autodidakt*.

It is melancholy to think that the article in which Ritschl charges Madvig with Philautia, Authadeia, Hybris, has been embalmed for all time in his *Opuscula* iii. 172. It would be well however if some young scholar would act upon his suggestion that a *critica vannus* might do good service in winnowing the chaff from the grain in Madvig's *Adversaria*. It is plain at first sight that Madvig's knowledge of metre was imperfect; many of his guesses on minor authors are hasty, and would have been abandoned by him on second thoughts; in some cases the common lexicons prove the correctness of readings which he condemns. His familiarity with ante- and post-classical Latin was by no means on a par with his mastery of Ciceronian and Livian style. Nor does he display that nice sense of usage which makes the study of J. F. Gronovius, Ruhnken, Heindorf, Cobet, so instructive. Robust common sense, revolting against impossibilities in thought or expression, a clear perception of what the context required, a close adherence to the *ductus litterarum*, seem to me his great merits as a critic.

JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

¹ See p. 117. 'Wie man die Begabung eines Kopfes wie Madvig auch bezeichnen möge, ein Geist ist er gar nicht.' How different the tone of Bücheler, the

present editor of the *Rh. Mus.*, who wrote in a presentation copy of a tract *MADVIGIO PHILOLOGORVM PRINCIPI S. PL. D. FRANC. BUECHELER GREGARIVS.*

NOTES ON CONDITIONAL SENTENCES.

GREATLY as the treatment of this subject has been improved by the labours of Goodwin, there seems to be still plenty of work for the reformer to do: and I gladly make use of the *Classical Review* in order to submit some views of my own to the notice of classical scholars. Considerations of space impose upon me brevity of statement and

general disregard of exceptional phenomena: in the following remarks therefore I shall (1) address myself mainly to Latin: (2) consider primarily sentences which I call 'normal,' i.e. which have the same mood and tense in both Protasis and Apodosis, and are not affected by external influences of mood or tense: (3) consider only the verb of the

Protasis. I shall be greatly obliged to any of my readers who will aid me by criticism.

I desire to direct my attack upon the following propositions which I have come to regard as *idola tribus grammaticae*.

I. That the Indicative in the Protasis implies 'reality.' This doctrine has indeed been given up by most authorities, but still lingers in some books, both German (*Realer Fall*), French and English. It is surely enough though to quote such instances as *Pro Milone* 91, 'excitate eum, si potestis, ab inferis,' *Pro Clu.* 62, 'redargue me si mentior,' *Pro Mur.* 80, 'cives, inquam, si eos hoc nomine appellari fas est.' No doubt the context often admits of the possibility that the speaker regards his condition as actually existing, but this is not expressed by the mood which he uses. To deny this is to fail to recognise that the Indicative after 'if' has not the same import as the Indicative in a simple sentence. In a condition the Indicative is colourless—the expression of a purely objective attitude.¹

II. That the Present Subjunctive in the Protasis implies 'possibility' (*Möglicher Fall*). This is the general view of English, French, and German grammars:² but can it be applied without violence? Take such perfectly normal instances as 'si existat hodie ab inferis Lycurgus, gaudeat murorum Spartae ruinis' (*Livy* xxxix. 37). It is easy to talk about 'subjective Möglichkeit' and 'fabulist's license,' but these are characteristic examples of the usage. How forced is the implication of 'possibility' in Hor. *Epist.* ii. 1. 3, 4, and countless instances. In this point I consider that the new world has outstripped the old: it was a great merit of Goodwin to base the whole treatment of conditional sentences including the

optative (with opt. and ἄν in Apodosis) upon distinctions of *time* instead of upon the categories of 'possibility, slight probability, complete uncertainty, impossibility,' (Farar): and his fellow-countrymen Allen and Greenough in their valuable Latin grammar have followed his lead in treating the Latin Present Subjunctive. Agreeing with them that this tense refers primarily to the Future, I would submit that the true implication of the mood has not yet been assigned. How does Goodwin distinguish εἰ πράσσοι from ἐὰν πράσῃ? The former, he says, is 'less vivid and distinct' than the latter. But how does he distinguish ἐὰν πράσῃ from εἰ πράξει? Again the former is less 'vivid' than the latter (M. and T. § 48, B. i, sixth edition). These three degrees of 'vividness' strike me as eminently unsatisfactory.—Allen and Greenough say that the Present Subjunctive implies 'improbability': this is going too far in the opposite direction: but at any rate it shows a grasp of a feature which runs through the whole class of sentences which have the Subjunctive in Latin (and ἄν in the Apodosis in Greek). That such sentences contain an implication—a sort of *arrière pensée*—is generally admitted in the cases referring to the past and present. Why has not this method been generally applied to future conditions also? Simply, I infer, because grammarians did not see what form of implication to suggest. We cannot speak of an implication of unreality throughout: but may we not say that εἰ πράσσοι τοῦτο, καλῶς ἂν ἔχοι 'if he were to do this, it would be well,'³ implies, *I do not say that he will (do it)*? I do not quote instances here, because any ordinary instances will do. Is not this the natural sense of 'si neget, mentiatur'? I should describe this as a future condition with reserve. Just as the Pluperfect and Imperfect Subjunctive warn the reader *not* to suppose that the writer means that his condition was or is realized, so the Present Subjunctive warns the reader not to suppose that the condition will be realized. Owing to the nature of the case we have in the first two cases practically an implication of unreality, in the latter case merely an expression of *reserve*, a sort of sign-post to caution the reader and protect the writer against a possible misconstruction. Using

¹ That the past tenses of the Indicative may be used to express *unreality* is maintained by Professor Priem of Posen in his learned paper in the *Philologus* (Supplem. V. 2, 1885): he quotes *De Div.* II. 127, 'Deus si quidem nobis consulebat, "hoc facito, hoc ne feceris" diceret,' *ibid.* II. 20, etc. But he rightly regards such sentences as quite exceptional; in some of his passages (e.g. *Pro Mil.* § 28, *Nat. Deor.* III. 79, 80) I doubt whether we have genuine instances of the 'Irrealer Fall.' In the genuine instances we should have an exact analogy to the French 's'il était' (= if he *were*), 's'il avait été' (= wenn er gewesen *wäre*).

² Mr. Roby, however, must be excepted. In his larger grammar (§ 1497) he says '(In hypothetical sentences) the Subjunctive implies that the action spoken of is not a fact. Nothing is implied as to probability or improbability, possibility or impossibility, so far as the mood is concerned; but a non-real *past* action is of course impossible, a non-real *future* action is (apart from intrinsic impossibilities) possible.'

³ *En passant* I protest against the translation so commonly given 'if he *should* do it, it *would* be well.' I doubt if this combination of *should* and *would* is normal modern English, though it may be easily paralleled from Shakspeare and is constant in certain subblique constructions.

the Present Subjunctive, the writer seems to me to say, 'In supposing this about a future case, do not imagine that I mean to prophecy that such and such a thing will ever happen.' If this is not the sense of the Greek and Latin, and of the English, 'if he were to deny it,' then we must admit that these languages have no means of expressing so natural an idea as a supposition referring to the future and accompanied by reserve. The future need not be a remote future: it may be but the future of the next moment. But even so, the reference is to an 'here-after.'¹

But I am far from wishing to limit the Present Subjunctive in Protasis to this sense: some instances, I admit, may be more simply explained as expressing a present supposition with reserve, and are more closely related to the *original jussive sense of the tense* (si sit = supposing it to be [I do not say that it is]): e.g. *Verr.* II. Lib. II. § 52, 'me dies, vox, latera deficient, si hoc nunc vociferari velim'; *Cat.* I. 18, 'patria tecum sic loquitur' . . . and then, § 19, 'Haec si tecum patria loquatur, nonne impetrare debeat' (this may refer to the future); *De Off.* I. 5, 'hic si sibi ipsi consentiat, neque amicitiam colere possit nec iustitiam, III. 12, 'si sciat . . . dicturusne sit.' Sometimes too, but very rarely in prose, the Present Subjunctive expresses a *rejected* supposition of the present: Ovid, *Met.* I. 400, 'quis hoc credat, nisi sit pro teste vetustas' ('were not,' i.e. implying 'it is'), *Pro Mur.* § 21, 'quam ego, si mihi per Servium liceat, pari atque in eadem laude ponam: sed non licet' ('ponam' may however be Future Indicative, cf. Reid on *Pro Arch.* § 4). In five books chosen at random (*Catilinarian Orations*, *Pro Sestio*, *Pro Mur.*, *Pro Arch.*, *Hor. Epist.*, Bk. I.), this is a solitary instance of this sense. Virg. *Georg.* IV. 117, 'ni vela traham' is a non-normal instance (canerem).

III. That the Imperfect Subjunctive in Protasis refers primarily to the past. This

¹ This method of treatment brings out the analogy between all tenses of the Subjunctive in conditional sentences. Strictly speaking all that is implied by the Imperfect and Pluperfect is mental reserve on the part of the speaker, reflecting upon the relation of his supposition to reality, but in past and present suppositions this reserve is tantamount to an implication of unreality: the future condition is necessarily undecided in regard to fulfilment. If any one is sceptical as to the possibility of the Present Subjunctive referring to the future, I would remind him of final and suboblique clauses and of the close similarity of form between the Future (Future Perfect) Indicative and Present (Perfect) Subjunctive in more than one conjugation.

appears to be the view of Dr. Kennedy, who says (*P. S. Lat. Gr.* § 213) 'si dares, negaret (lit.) if you had been offering, he would have been refusing (*often* = if you offered he would refuse).' It was also the view of Mr. Roby (*Elementary Latin Grammar*, 1862, § 240) 'si periret, dolerem, if he had been perishing, I should have been grieving.' In his later books he says the tense is used in both clauses 'of an action supposed contrary to fact to be already occurring in the present time, or of a continuous state supposed, contrary to the fact, to have existed in past time,' (*Latin Grammar*, § 1530). That is, he now puts the reference to the present and the past on the same footing. In his examples he quotes *Pro Clu.* § 80, 'at tum si dicerem, non audirer,' as if it were quite an ordinary case. Even this modified position seems to me misleading. In Germany the view that the Imperfect Subjunctive in the large majority of cases expresses the rejected supposition of the *present* [e.g. 'nisi Alexander essem, Diogenes esse vellem,' if I were² not Alexander (as I am)] is universally held (*Irrealis der Gegenwart*).

Dr. Priem, who is a staunch defender of the accepted German view, quotes from the whole of Cicero only fifty-one instances of sentences with Imperfect Subjunctive in both clauses with clear reference to the past. Caesar has not a single one. Of these fifty-one (add *De Fin.* I. 7), ten are 'verba des kommen's und müssen's,' which are of course exceptional. I do not pretend to have a definite view about all of the remaining forty-one: but it is clear to me that at least twelve of them have not the simple conditional sense: five contain deliberative Subjunctives in Apodosis (e.g. *Phil.* II. 26), two contain 'ut' for 'si' (*Verr.* IV. 16, 58); *Pro Cael.* 62, contains two very peculiar cases; in *Pro Clu.* 16, the Apodosis, depends on *ne* (acc. to MSS.), in *Verr.* III. 31, 'si' is omitted; in *De Off.* III. 75, 'dares' is jussive. In such cases I do not at all deny that the Imperfect Apodosis refers to the past: but I do deny that its use is to be regarded as parallel to *Pro Clu.* 80, 'at tum si dicerem, non audirer.' Dr. Priem gives no statistics of what he regards as the ordinary sense of the Imperfect (referring to present time). In order therefore to get an

² That this *may* be translated in English 'if I had not been Alexander' etc. proves nothing as to a reference to the past. The utterance of Alexander necessarily refers to the moment when he makes the acquaintance of D. We have here to deal with a peculiarity of English idiom.

idea of relative numbers, I have examined five books, chosen at random. I hope the

following statistics are approximately accurate:—

	NORMAL INSTANCES.		
	Reference to present time.	Reference to past time.	Doubtful.
<i>Catilinarian Orations</i>	I. 7, 17 (three examples) II. 6, 12 (possem)	None	
<i>Pro Murena</i>	§ 4 (constitueretur: habitual) § 5 (confiterer) (defenderem) § 33 (esset: good instance) § 82 (possent) § 83 (posset: twice)	None	
<i>Pro Archia</i>	§ 16 (ostenderetur) (peteretur) § 17 (possemus) § 29 (praesentiret) (terminaret)	None	
<i>Pro Sestio</i>	§ 14 (vellem)	§ 63 (expelleretur) (veniret: good instance) § 64 (vellent: cf. <i>Pro Cl.</i> 80)	§ 81 (cogitaretis) § 134 (peccaret)
Hor. <i>Epist.</i> Bk. I.	3, 26 (posses) 7, 93 (velles) 17, 13 (pranderet) 17, 14 (sciret: good instance)		17, 50 (posset) 19, 18 (pallerem)

These results¹ coincide entirely with my general impression that sentences like *Pro Clu.* are quite exceptional. There is no doubt another class of sentences in which the Imperfect Subjunctive with past reference is much commoner: I mean those in which the Apodosis has the Pluperfect Subjunctive. In the Protasis the action is then marked as relatively present, *i.e.* contemporaneous with the action of the Apodosis: *e.g.* *De Amic.* 13 ‘quod non fecissent profecto, si nihil ad eos pertinere arbitrarentur.’²

There is yet another set of instances in which the Imperfect refers to the past, *i.e.* those in which we have an Indicative in Apodosis, *e.g.* *De Amic.* 11 ‘Nisi enim immortalitatem optare vellet, quid non adeptus est, quod homini fas esset optare’: here *vellet* refers indeed to the past, but it is not a case of

rejected supposition. Such cases demand further investigation. I have collected a few: *Caes. B. C.* iii. 44 ‘Pompeius prohibere non poterat nisi *vellet*,’ etc.; *B. G.* vi. 34 ‘si negotium confici *vellet*, dimittendae erant plures manus; si continere ad signa manipulos *vellet*, locus ipse *erat* praesidio barbaris’ (Madvig’s rule, § 348, obs. 3 does not apply to the latter clause); v. 35 ‘sin autem locum tenere vellent, nec virtuti locus relinquebatur,’ etc. (four other instances from *B. G.*); *Sen. Dial.* vi. 22, § 6 ‘Quid faceret? Si vivere *vellet*, Sejanus rogandus erat.’

I believe that one reason for the prominence given to the comparatively small number of instances referring to the past has been a difficulty in understanding how the Imperfect can refer to the present time. But this is a common feature of Indo-European languages in Conditional sentences with rejected supposition; as Mr. H. Bradley says (*Academy*, January 30, 1886), ‘a tense inflection is made to do duty to express what is really a distinction of mood—or, in other words, a distinction affecting the class of the sentence... The condition is not *now* a true one, and so is referred to an imaginary past time, etc.’ In fact a sort of ‘Tempus-

¹ Cf. *Epist.* II. 2, 145 f. (*cupis* 148), *Virg. Aen.* XII. 810.

² Mr. Reid says on § 13: ‘it does not often happen that the Apodosis has a verb in the Pluperfect, while the verb of the Protasis stands in the Imperfect.’ I have however noted in the five books above referred to seven instances: *Cat.* i. 12, 29; ii. 2, 3; *Pro Sest.* 45; *Pro Mur.* § 8, § 17, § 46; *Pro Arch.* § 16. A large number are given by Priem (pp. 264 f.)

verschiebung' takes place: the Imperfect expresses the unreal supposition of the present, *si scirem* 'If I knew (which I do not)'; the Pluperfect expresses the unreal supposition of the past, *si vidissem* 'If I had seen (which I did not).' In Latin and German we have also 'Modusverschiebung': in French not so.

But whatever the explanation, there can be no doubt of the fact. In the following instances all reference to the past is absolutely excluded:

(a) *Verr.* iv. 70 '*si iudex non esses, te potissimum hoc petere oporteret*'; *Leg. Agr.* ii. 85 '*si ad vos esset singulos aliquid ex hoc agro perventurum, tamen honestius eum universi possideretis*.'

(b) Reference to present shown by a preceding Present tense: *Verr.* ii. Lib. i. 70 '*Non potest dicere, etc. Quae si diceret, tamen ignosci non oporteret*'; *ibid.* iii. 91 '*si id quod maxime vis, posses probare, etc., tamen haec pecuniae tibi damnationi esse deberent*'; *ibid.* iv. 114 '*neque haec externa vobis est religio: quod si esset, tamen... sancire vos velle oporteret*'; *Pro Clu.* 183 '*Hoc uno modo saepe veritas emergit quod aut ii, qui ad fraudem callidi sunt, non tantum audent, aut etc. Quod si aut confidens astutia aut callida esset audacia*' etc. *Pro Planc.* 5 '*Perdificilis mihi defensionis ratio proponitur. Nam si tantummodo mihi necesse esset contra Laterensem dicere, tamen id ipsum esset molestum*'; *Pro Mil.* 10 '*Quid gladii volunt? quos habere certe non liceret, si uti illis nullo pacto liceret*.'

(c) Reference to present shown by a pronoun or adverb: *Verr.* ii. Lib. ii. 15 '*si ita esset, tamen vos in hac quaestione audire oporteret*'; *Pro Clu.* 18 '*Hoc tempore sileret omnia*' etc.; *Prov. Cons.* 47 '*Si essent inimitiae mihi cum Caesare, tamen hoc tempore*

reipublicae consulere deberem'; *Pro Mur.* 33 '*si mihi nunc de rebus gestis esset dicendum, plurima proelia commemorare possem*'; *Phil.* iii. 33 '*si tum illi respondere voluissem, nunc rei publicae consulere non possem*'; *Phil.* iv. 1 '*Quod si ante facere conatus essem, nunc facere non possem*.'

IV. That the Imperfect Subjunctive is ordinarily the equivalent of the Greek Optative. This is distinctly asserted by Farrar (*Greek Grammar Rules*, § 93, eighteenth edition: '*εἴ τι ἔχοι, δίδοιγ' ἂν* if he were to have anything, he would give it: *si quid habeat det, or more frequently si quid haberet, daret*'). I think I have occasionally noticed the same view in commentaries and exercise books, though I do not know of any grammar that asserts it. To me this is tantamount to saying that the Imperfect ordinarily refers to the future. Is there really any justification for this view? Of course in suboblique and virtually suboblique clauses the Imperfect regularly represents a future tense ('*docebat si Naturam sequeremur, nunquam nos aberraturos esse*.' '*Si non periret immiserabilis*' etc. and countless other instances). English here regularly uses *should*. Again in the *Apodosis* there may be said to be generally some kind of future reference (Madvig, § 347 b). Further I do not maintain that the Imperfect in Protasis *never* refers to the future: it may perhaps do so *e.g.* in *Hor. Od.* ii. 5, 21, *Epist.* i. 19, 18 (where Con. translates 'should my colour fail': here however I prefer Wilkins' rendering 'if I were pale' or else a reference to the past: cf. line 10), *Cic. Div. in Caec.* § 39 '*si te natura adjuvaret*.' But I maintain that this usage is so entirely exceptional that it ought to be excluded from school books.

E. A. SONNENSCHIEIN.

ARISTOPHANICA.

Ran. 86—88.

Dionysus, in accounting for his desire to bring back Euripides to the world above, says to Heracles that the good poets are all gone, and none save the poorest representatives of the art remain, the only respectable poet, Agathon, having gone to the luxurious court of Macedon, *ἐς Μακάρων εὐωχίαν*, 'to the blest—abroad.' Among other inquiries, Heracles asks where are Xenocles and Pythangelus, thus:—

ΗΡΑΚΛ. ὁ δὲ Ξενοκλῆς;

ΔΙΟΝ. ἐξόλοιτο τὴν Δία.

ΗΡΑΚΛ. Πυθαγγελὸς δέ;

ΔΙΟΝ.

ΞΑΝΘΙΑΣ.

περὶ ἐμοῦ δ' οὐδὲν λόγος
ἐπιτριβομένου τὸν ὄμιον οὕτωςι σφόδρα.

It is generally agreed that the words with which Dionysus receives the mention of Pythangelus have fallen out, and the text

is so arranged in the best editions as to indicate this lacuna. Presumably the reflection of Dionysus on Pythangelus was similar in purport to his remark on Xenocles. The dropping out of the verse would be accounted for, and the remark of Xanthias would gain point, if the lacuna were filled thus:—

ΗΡΑΚΛ. Πυθάγγελος δέ;

ΔΙΟΝ. περί γε τοῦδ' οὐδεὶς λόγος
πλὴν τοῦπιτριβεύης.

ΞΑΝΘΙΑΣ. περί ἐμοῦ δ' οὐδεὶς λόγος
ἐπιτριβομένου τὸν ὄμον οὕτως σφόδρα.

Dionysus says there is nothing to say about him, but the well-known 'Attic shibboleth,' to which the poet elsewhere refers, *e.g.* *Thesm.* 557, *Av.* 1528, ἐντεῦθεν ἄρα τοῦπιτριβεύης ἐγένετο.

308.

ὁδὶ δὲ δείσας ὑπερεπυρρίασέ μου.

The last word is usually changed to σου. But is not the text sound, the allusion being to the name of the speaker Ξανθίας?

346—348.

ἀποσείονται δὲ λύπας,
χρονίους τ' ἐτῶν παλαιῶν ἐνιαυτούς,
ιέρᾱς ὑπὸ τιμᾱς.

The phrase ἐτῶν ἐνιαυτούς is 'a vile phrase.' The antistrophic word is μύρτων, hence Koch ὁστῶν, others ἰνῶν, γυίων, μελῶν. Would it not be better to transpose the τ' and read

ἀποσείονται δὲ λύπας
χρονίους ἐτῶν παλαιῶν, ἐνιαυτούς θ',
ιέρᾱς ὑπὸ τιμᾱς.

The old men under the influence of the mystic Eleusinian rite shake off not only the whips and scorns of time, but the very burden of the years themselves. The corruption may have arisen from the fact that some copyist did not see that χρονίους agrees with λύπας. If it be held with most edd. that τ' ἐτῶν is corrupt, I would rather read:—

ἀποσείονται δὲ λύπας
χρονίους, τηθῶν παλαιῶν ἐνιαυτούς,

'their old grandam years,' that is, 'years such as are attained by old grandams'; ἐνιαυτούς would be in apposition with λυπάς, the years being themselves called 'heart-aches.'

572, 573.

ὥς ἡδέως ἂν σου λίθῳ τοὺς γομφίους
κόπτοιμ' ἂν οἷς μου κατέφαγες τὰ φορτία.

Surely ἐκκόπτειν is the verb required. Read:—

ὥς ἡδέως ἂν σου λίθῳ 'κκόπτοιμ' ἐγὼ
τοὺς γομφίους οἷς κατέφαγες τὰ φορτία.

761.

νόμος τις ἐνθάδ' ἐστὶ κείμενος
ἀπὸ τῶν τεχνῶν, ὅσαι μεγάλαι καὶ δεξιάι,
τὸν ἄριστον ὄντα τῶν ἑαυτοῦ συντέχνων
σίτησιν αὐτὸν ἐν Πρυτανείῳ λαμβάνειν.

This is usually translated: 'there is a law here concerning such arts as are dignified and intellectual, that he who is best of his own fellow craftsmen should obtain free commons in the town-hall.' Now it seems to me very rash to ascribe here to Aristophanes an isolated usage of a common preposition which the commentators do not attempt to defend except by appealing to the language of Homer and Herodotus. To prove that ἀπὸ has the force of περί, Kock quotes *Il.* xxii. 126, οὐ μὲν πως νῦν ἔστιν ἀπὸ δρυὸς οὐδ' ἀπὸ πέτρης | τῷ ὀαριζέμεναι, where surely the prep. bears its ordinary sense of 'from.' Neither do the passages adduced from Hdt. seem to me by any means to justify a doctrine (which Liddell and Scott rightly, as I think, repudiate), that ἀπὸ has sometimes the force of περί. I think ταῦτα μὲν τὰ ἀπὸ τούτων τῶν ποταμῶν, Hdt. iv. 54, means, 'these are the accounts which reach us from these rivers' that is, 'these are the statements made by the people through whose countries these rivers flow.' The similar phrase τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς νήσου, iv. 195, should be explained in the same way. And surely in vii. 195, ἐξιστορήσαντες τὰ ἐβούλοντο πυθέσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς Ξερξέω στρατιῆς, the meaning is 'the news from the army of Xerxes.'

Instead, therefore, of τῶν ἑαυτοῦ, where ἑαυτοῦ is mere surplusage, I would read τὴν ἑαυτοῦ (sc. τέχνην). The meaning would then be, 'There is a law here that out of all the fine arts, he who is best of his fellow craftsmen in his own art should have free commons.' 'The best of his fellow craftsmen' for 'better than any of his fellow craftsmen' is an idiom too familiar to require illustration. In addition to the great uncertainty whether ἀπὸ could have the force of περί, and could be so used by Aristophanes, the passage labours under another defect; the verses as they now stand would imply that the reward would go to him who was best in all the fine arts; whereas the meaning is that the man who had carried his art whatever it was (provided only it was a fine art) to the highest pitch of perfection should obtain the prize. The meaning ascribed to ἀπὸ in my version is quite normal, cp. Thuc. vii. 87, Hdt. vi. 27. Mr. Blaydes reads ἐπὶ for ἀπὸ, disbelieving, no doubt, in ἀπὸ = περί.

819.

σκινδαλάμων τε παραξόνια, σμιλεύματά τ' ἔργων.

Herwerden, *Hermes*, xvi. p. 352, admirably emends παραξόνια, which really has no meaning. He reads παραξόανα a word formed from παραξέω. The meaning would be 'shavings' or 'filings,' the very word required. The conjecture has not yet found its way into any edition.

948.

ἔπειτ' ἀπὸ τῶν πρώτων ἐπῶν οὐδὲν παρήκ' ἂν ἀργόν.

It has been suggested to read οὐδένα. But οὐδὲν ἀργόν means 'no shirking of work,' 'no case of idleness,' cp. Eur. *Bacch.* 262,

οὐχ ὕγιες οὐδὲν ἔτι λέγω τῶν ὀργίων.

'I say there is *no sound spot* in the orgies,' it is all masqued licentiousness. So βροτῶν οὐδὲν μακαρίζω, Soph. *O. T.* 1196 and examples quoted by Jebb.

1028, 1029.

ἐχάρην γοῦν ἡνίκ' ἤκουσα περὶ Δαρείου τεθνεώτος,
ὁ χορὸς δ' εὐθὺς τῷ χεῖρ' ὠδὶ συγκρούσας εἶπεν ἱανοῖ.

This passage has been *varie vexatus*, but I do not think it has been yet emended. It is to be premised that the consideration of these verses is not complicated with the question whether there was a second edition of the *Persae*. For it is well-nigh incredible that a second edition could have so completely broken away from the lines on which the first edition was constructed as to introduce an announcement of the death of Darius. Therefore ἀπηγγέλθῃ περὶ Δαρείου τεθνεώτος cannot be accepted. Not more satisfactory are the other *medelae* which have been proposed. Some of the latest texts give, or record with approval:—

ἐχάρην γοῦν τῇ νίκῃ ἀκούσας παρὰ Δαρείου τεθνεώτος.

On this I would ask, can any reader of the *Classical Review* adduce a metrical monstrosity parallel to that in the third foot of the verse so arranged—a dactyl cut with a trochaic caesura involving elision of a naturally long vowel before a short? But, waiving this question, we must remember that it is *not* when the ghost of Darius announces the future Grecian victory of Plataea that the chorus exclaim ἱανοῖ. It is when Xerxes announces and bewails the past Persian disaster of Salamis (*Pers.* 754, 966). I would therefore read:—

ἐχάρην γοῦν ἡνίκ' ἐκόκυσας, παῖ Δαρείου τεθνεώτος,

ὁ χορὸς δ' εὐθὺς τῷ χεῖρ' ὠδὶ συγκρούσας εἶπεν
(ἀντὶ)

Darius often calls Xerxes παῖς ἐμός *e.g.* 739, 751, 782; κἀνακωκύσας λιγύ is said of Xerxes 468; cp. also 426, 427:—

οἰμωγὴ δ' ὁμοῦ
κωκύμασιν κατεῖχε πελαγίαν ἄλλα.

I will add another conjecture more daring but nearer to the MSS. It is not impossible that the poet wrote:—

ἐχάρην γοῦν ἡνίκ' ἐκόκυσας, πόρι Δαρείου τεθνεώτος,

but though πόρτις is applied to Epaphus by Aesch., and Eur. calls a girl πόρις, yet there is no certain warrant for πόρις 'son' or 'boy,' though such a term would be applicable to Xerxes, whose youth and vanity are throughout the *Persae* contrasted with the manly resolution of the dead Darius (see esp. 755). 1124.

πρῶτον δέ μοι τὸν ἐξ Ὀρεστείας λέγε.

Surely for τὸν we should read τιν'. How could the first verses of the *Choeph.* be called 'the prologue from the Oresteia?' While it is, of course, a prologue out of the Oresteia. Besides, the question was as to the Aeschylean prologue in general, and Eur. would not have indicated one particular prologue to serve as a test, but would have given to his rival some latitude of choice.

1298.

ἀλλ' οὖν ἐγὼ μὲν ἐς τὸ καλὸν ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦ ἤνεγκον αὐθ'.

The translation 'I transferred them from one honourable place to another' does not seem to have much point. If ἱμοιοστροφον is rightly explained 'rope-maker' in the verse before, I would propose to introduce a play on words by reading ἐκ τοῦ κάλω.

As the *Persae* has been introduced into the note on 1028, I may point out what seems to me a grave corruption in *Pers.*

163.

μὴ μέγας πλοῦτος κορίσας οὐδας ἀντρέψῃ ποδὶ ὀλβον ὅν Δαρεῖος ἤρην οὐκ ἀνὲν θεῶν τιός.

I do not see how κορίσας can be explained. It is generally taken with οὐδας as if κορίσας οὐδας meant 'having careered over the plain.' But such a figure would be most unnatural—bloating wealth *career*ing over the plain as a prelude to kicking down the fabric of prosperity. Besides, οὐδας is not πεδίον, it is the 'ground, floor,' that low place to which one is dragged or hurled down, not that surface over which one careers. I would certainly take οὐδας with ἀντρέψῃ 'dash to the ground.' For κορίσας I have nothing better to suggest than γοιῆς ἥς. I should much prefer a parti-

ciple having the same meaning as *παχυνθείς* (*Theb.* 771), but what participle is there of this meaning which could possibly be corrupted into *κορίσας*?

I add a few notes on the *Pax* and *Nubes*. *Pax* 129, 130.

ἐν τοῖσιν Διςώπον λόγοις ἐξευρέθη
μόνος πετεινῶν ἐς θεοὺς ἀφιγμένος.

This is said of the *κάνθαρος*. It strikes one at once as strange that the *κάνθαρος* should be classed among *πετεινοί*. But still stranger does this word appear when we read in the Scholiast's note that the fable told how the beetle made his way into the presence of Zeus to avenge himself on the eagle who had stolen his grubs, and taken refuge with Zeus. So the eagle, at all events, was there before him. Read *μόνος ἐπιγείων* which is very like in uncial letters. Cp. οὐ μόνον φυτοῖς ἐγγείοις ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν ἐπιγείοις ζώοις, *Plat.* 546 A.

741-744.

τοὺς δ' Ἡρακλέας τοὺς μάττοντας καὶ τοὺς
πεινῶντας ἐκείνους
τοὺς φεύγοντας κάξαπατῶντας καὶ τυπτομένους
ἐπίτηδες
ἐξήλασ' ἀτιμώσας πρῶτος, καὶ τοὺς δούλους
παρέλυσε
οὓς ἐξήγον κλάοντας αἰεί.

Recent editors transpose the second and third verses of the above passage, apparently not finding the second verse applicable to the character of Heracles. But the passage of the *Ranae* beginning 549, shows Heracles as a robber and cheat, and 571ff, and again 605ff, show that Heracles was not regarded by the comic poets as out of the reach of personal violence. The words *τοὺς φεύγοντας* seem to me fatal to the proposed transposition, for Aristophanes would use *διδράσκω*, or some of the words akin to it, and not *φεύγω*, to describe runaway slaves: while *φεύγοντας* would suggest 'exiles' or 'defendants.' But Heracles was not above 'bolting,' as we may observe in *Ran.* 567,

ὁ δ' ὄχρε' ἐξάξας γε τὰς ψιάθους λαβών.

However, perhaps for *φεύγοντας* we should read *φεύζοντας*, for *φεῦ* is an exclamation of anger as well as grief, and in the verse *Ran.* 562

ἔβλεψεν εἰς με δριμὺν κάμυκᾶτό γε

there may be a reference to a fierce *φενγμός*, not unlike the *μυγμός* and *ὠγμός* of the *Eumenides* of Aeschylus.

989, 990.

οἱ σοῦ τρυχώμεθ' ἤδη
τρία καὶ δέκ' ἔτη.

The Peloponnesian war cannot be said to have lasted thirteen years when the *Pax* was performed in 421. Perhaps under *τρία καὶ* is concealed some very rare word which has caused the corruption. Perhaps Ar. wrote *τρικακοὶ* or *τρικακῶς* in the sense of 'in desperate plight,' a word not found elsewhere but formed analogically with *τριδουλος*, *τριπρατός*, *τριθαλής*, *τριγέρων*. Or perhaps the comic poet here used a word found elsewhere only in late writers, and apparently applied to garments, *τριβακοί*, 'worn out.' I believe that the final syllables of *καρτερία* have in like manner given rise to a corrupt *τρία* in *Thuc.* ii. 65, where for *τρία μὲν ἔτη ἀντείχον* I have already proposed [*καρ*]τερία μενετῇ ἀντείχον.

1183.

εἶτα προσστὰς πρὸς τὸν ἀνδριάντα τοῦ Παν-
δίωνος
εἶδεν αὐτόν, κάπορῶν θεῖ, τῷ κακῷ βλέπων
ὀπόν.

'He sees his own name down for service and dumfounded by his hard case—he runs'; whither? and what could be more unnatural than to run about aimlessly? I think we should read *ζεῖ*, a word appropriate to *ἀπορῶν*, instead of *θεῖ*. There is no trace of *θεῖ* in the Scholia; while *εἰς ἀμηχανίαν καὶ ἀπορίαν περιίσταται* might well be a note on *ἀπορῶν ζεῖ*, *trepidans aestuat*.

Nubes 281.

ἵνα
τηλεφανεῖς σκοπιάς ἀφορώμεθα
καρπούς τ' ἀρδομένην ἱερὰν χθόνα
καὶ ποταμῶν ζαθέων κελαδήματα.

The Cloud-maidens resolve to win their way from the bosom of Ocean to the summit of the lofty mountain, and then their song goes on in the words quoted. But they would fly to a mountain-top to look down on the earth, not to gaze at distant peaks. I would read:—

ἵνα
τηλεφανοῦς σκοπιᾶς ἀφορώμεθα
καρπούς τ' ἀλδομένην ἱερὰν χθόνα,
καὶ ποταμῶν ζαθέων κελαδήματα.

'That from such a specular height we may look upon the earth teeming with fruit and the brawlings of the mighty torrents.' (Will any reader of the *Classical Review* suggest a translation for *ζαθέων*?). In the almost immediately succeeding verses we have the gen. *ιδέας* depending on the prep. in *ἀποσεισάμεναι*. Cp. *μοι παρορᾶς* = *ὁρᾶς παρ' ἐμοί* *Av.* 454.

1414, 1415.

καὶ μὴν ἔφυν ἐλεύθερός γε κἀγώ
κλάουσι παῖδες, πατέρα δ' οὐ κλάειν δοκεῖς.

It is not likely that an iambic trimeter, even though a parody of an Euripidean senarius, would be introduced into a passage written in tetrameters catalectic. I do not think any of the words suggested to fill the *lacuna* (e.g. *προσῆκειν* or *σὺ χρῆναι*) are such words as

would have probably fallen out. I would suggest *δοκῶ γῶ*, 'I think he should.' Its resemblance to the last words of the foregoing verse would account for its loss.

ROBERT Y. TYRRELL.

SOME SCHOOL EDITIONS OF GREEK PLAYS.

Sophocles for the use of Schools. Edited with Introductions and English Notes, by LEWIS CAMPBELL, M.A., LL.D., Professor of Greek in the University of St. Andrew's, and EVELYN ABBOTT, M.A., LL.D., Balliol College, Oxford. New and Revised Edition. In Two Volumes. Vol. I. Text. Vol. II. Explanatory Notes. 10s. 6d.

Editions of the Medea.

With Notes, by M. G. GLAZEBROOK, M.A., Assistant-Master at Harrow School. Rivingtons. 1886. 2s. 6d.

With Introduction and Notes, by C. B. HEBERDEN, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Brasenose College, Oxford. Part I. Introduction and Text. Part II. Notes. 1886. 2s.

Scholarum in usum edidit TH. BARTHOLD. (Metra recensuit W. Christ). Prague, F. Tempsky. Leipzig, G. Freytag.

IN the new edition of Campbell and Abbott's 'Sophocles', the first volume includes with the text a full general introduction, comprising a life &c., and short articles on the grammar of Sophocles, the metres, and the MSS.; in the second volume with the notes are special introductions to each play, an index of Greek words, and a general index. The form of the book is neat, the execution careful, and the whole deserves a strong recommendation.

In the general introduction, under the head 'Improvements introduced by Sophocles into the Art of Tragedy', p. xi., is a statement which anticipates and corrects an error in the special introduction to the *Antigone*: 'While there are two actors only in the *Supplices* and *Persae*, and two alone speak, even if three are on the stage, in the *Septem contra Thebas*, three speakers are admitted in the *Oresteia*. In his later work, therefore, Aeschylus availed himself of the practice of Sophocles.' Here appears to be adopted the correct view, that in the closing

scene of the *Septem* Ismene remains on the stage and leaves it only at the end, though from the entrance of the herald she is silent; whereas in vol. ii. p. 94, 'the fact that Aeschylus in the *Septem* employs two actors only makes it necessary that Ismene should withdraw to make room for the herald, and thus we are left in uncertainty with regard to her action.' This inference, resting only on misconstruction of the phrase 'employment of two actors', cannot be true; it is unnatural and dramatically impossible that Ismene should quit the stage at the entrance of the herald, or at any time before the end of the piece, and there is no reason to doubt that she follows the bier of Eteocles, thus forecasting the contrast of character between the sisters, which is developed by Sophocles in the *Antigone*.

The section on grammar is interesting and good. Here and there a remark might perhaps be modified. 'The middle future for the passive is not uncommon.' This way of putting the matter is apt to dismay a learner, and confuse his notions of language. The truth is that in archaic Greek for many verb-forms the futures 'middle' and 'passive' are the same, like the presents. It is the later distinct forms for the future passive which are in tragedy to be regarded as 'peculiar': *φνλάξομαι*, *I shall be watched*, is as regular as *φνλάσσομαι*, *I am watched*.—The indicative with *ἄν* in *O.T.* 523, *ἦλθε τάχ' ἄν*, '*it may have come*,' '*it probably did come*', should not be marked as peculiar. It is as regular as the more common use to indicate that which would have happened but for interfering circumstances. The addition of *ἄν* merely shows that the past action was conditioned; whether the conditions were favourable or adverse is to be gathered only from the context. For examples see Krueger, *Greek Grammar*, § 392a, 4 and 5.—'In the use of the relative observe that *ὅστις* is used for *ὅς*, *O.T.* 1054, 1335, *Ai.* 1300.' This seems to be a mistake, and it is certainly not proved

by the references. In the first Oedipus is asking Jocasta whether the peasant already sent for is likely to be the person from whom the Corinthian messenger received the exposed child:—

γύναι, νοεῖς ἐκεῖνον, ὄντιν' ἀρτίως
μολεῖν ἐφιέμεσθα; τόνδ' οὗτος λέγει;

The difference here between ὄντινα and ὄν is sensible enough, though perhaps not expressible; it is in full 'the man, however he is to be called, whom &c.', and imports both a certain impatience in the speaker and the fact that the person addressed is better informed. In the second—

τί γὰρ ἔδει μ' ὀρᾶν,
ὅτῳ γ' ὀρῶντι μηδὲν ἦν ἰδεῖν γλυκύ;—

if ᾧ had been used, we should more properly have said that it had the force of ὅτῳ, which is regular in a causal relative sentence, 'since seeing I could behold nothing of delight.' The third case is somewhat different—

ὃς ἐκ πατρὸς μὲν εἰμι Τελαμῶνος γεγώς,
ὅστις στρατοῦ τὰ πρῶτ' ἀριστεύσας ἐμὴν
ἔχει ξύνευνον μητέρα—

but neither here is ὅστις used indifferently. It is not simply 'who' but 'one that'. The point which Teucer makes is that the circumstances of the case prove the high distinction of his father, his mother having been given to the greatest soldier *as such*, ἐκείνῳ ὅστις ἠρίστευσε τὰ πρῶτα.

The introductions to the several plays are pleasant and useful reading. In that to the *Antigone* (vol. ii. p. 172) there are some very true remarks, which should be weighed before the Chorus of Greek drama is again spoken of as representing an ideal spectator. The Chorus of the *Antigone* might with more truth be described as a foil to the wit of a moderately appreciative audience. In the preface to the *Oedipus Tyrannus* (vol. ii. p. 1) there is one section which, I must confess, puzzles me. The editors apparently think that the horror of Oedipus at the discovery of his position is less easily intelligible to us than to the Greeks, and would help us to 'a simple and profound impression' by explanations which strike me as rather confusing. No doubt the action of Oedipus seems to us extravagant. So it did to the Oedipus of the *Coloneus*, and still more to the Eteocles of the *Phoenissae*. But even this curious and rather interesting person does not find it unnatural. Nor, I suppose, do we.

It is plainly impossible to attempt here any extended discussion of the difficulties of Sophocles. The editors' notes appear to be

very complete; positive errors, it is perhaps needless to say, are very seldom to be found. In *O.T.* 22 'ἄγαν σαλεύει *is fiercely tempest-tossed*' misses the point; ἄγαν has the full sense *too much* and is closely connected with ἤδη, omitted in the lemma of the note; the storm-beaten vessel can *now* sustain no more. On *O.T.* 281, 'οἷδ' ἂν εἰς *no man whatever*' would mislead a student; it should have been οἷδ' . . . εἰς; ἂν is of course constructed with the verb. Every book has a few slips of this kind, and here they are very few.

In revising the *Oedipus* plays the edition of Jebb has been used, but not in my judgment as fully by any means as it might have been. At *O.T.* 1091 the editors still give the MS. reading Οἰδίπου and 'supply ἡμᾶς': Jebb's Οἰδίπου is not, I think, even mentioned. It might have been adopted, at all events in a school-edition, where simplicity is desirable for its own sake. Later work, *e.g.* Whitelaw's papers in the *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, offer further material to be considered. But the book, as it is, is good, and well worth a place in a school-boy's library.

In spite of controversy there is at least one 'classical' masterpiece which does not seem to be losing its hold upon teachers and learners. This Review is hardly started, when already three small editions of the *Medea* are sent in, and the field is not unoccupied either in England or in Germany. But the *Medea* will support them all, and doubtless more, if more should offer.

Of the three, that of Mr. Glazebrook is certainly the most interesting, being in its form a more or less original experiment. In my own judgment it is also decidedly the best; but I am perhaps not an unimpeachable arbiter. The most marked differences between the two English editions proceed from a difference of view as to what a school-text should be. It is quite maintainable that an author like Euripides, depending on fair MSS., should for ordinary reading be printed without any change at all, plausible corrections (there is perhaps no such thing as a certain correction) being given, where desirable, in notes. And it is certain, that if conjectures are admitted at all, they must be admitted for various grounds in places not only construable but perfectly easy, as, for instance, where none of the MS. readings can be supposed the parent of the rest, and the original must therefore have differed from all. For school purposes, however, it is plainly needful that there should be both more change and less change. It is useless

to offer to a mind labouring at the elements sentences which one versed in the bye-ways of the language can just believe to have escaped the writer in a fit of subtlety or of negligence: and the discussion provoked by such passages conveys to the learner, if he reads it, nothing but vexation that he should be asked to learn what nobody seems to know. On the other hand, critical doubts are nothing to the beginner if they are not based on grammatical difficulty. The first and last requirement is a text beyond all question construable and explicable on common principles. A competent teacher will of course supply himself with critical materials, and use them as circumstances admit; but they are out of place in a class-book. All this may be commonplace, but it is only now obtaining an imperfect recognition. To take an instance: in *Med.* 1051, τῆς ἐμῆς κάκης, | τὸ καὶ προέσθαι μαλθακὸν λόγους φρενί, the MSS. vary between φρενί and φρενός. Both give doubtful grammar and doubtful sense. Something of a case could be made for either, and the argument might be highly instructive to a professional scholar, whatever the value of the result. No one else has any interest in the MS. reading. Badham's προσέσθαι . . . φρενί removes all difficulty, and is, if any is, the received text. Mr. Glazebrook prints it and occupies the whole of his note with the explanation which, for most people, it requires. Surely this is the right way. Mr. Heberden, whose notes are of the old form, critical notes in miniature, prints προέσθαι, and being thus involved in a discussion for which he has not room, is led into the statement, misleading if made without reserve, that 'προέσθαι = to utter'. The sole practical effect of this discussion is to divert attention from προσέσθαι, which finally appears as a conjecture of 'much probability'. Teachers will judge how much consideration the ordinary student will give to a conjecture of 'much probability'. The net result is that, while the two editors are much of the same opinion, the one note will and the other will not convey that opinion to the intended reader; and these notes are a fair sample of the respective methods. Both as to readings and interpretations, Mr. Glazebrook makes it a first principle to avoid debate; and for the purpose in hand he is perfectly right. There should however have been an appendix—a page would be enough—stating the reading of the MSS. whenever it varies importantly from the printed text. Instead of this we have what is of little use, a list of emendations admitted in the text which

are not found in the edition of Prinz; and even this is incomplete; in 890, for instance, the text has χρῆ ἑομοιοῦσθαι, which, as I have the best reason for knowing, is not in the edition of Prinz.

Another unconventional and useful plan of Mr. Glazebrook's is the division of the play into acts and scenes, with head-notes, stage-directions, &c., like Mr. A. Sidgwick's, only on a more extended scale. It has even a certain scientific value, since it forces the editor and the student to imagine clearly the representation of the play, and thus brings out problems which are apt to be overlooked, but are not beyond the capacity of beginners. Thus Mr. Glazebrook is obliged to have a theory on a question commonly ignored, yet most important to the play,—at what time Medea prepares the poisoned gifts?¹ He places the preparation between v. 823 and v. 844—a solution not without difficulties, but perhaps as good as any. By the way, an 'entr'acte' cannot surely come in the middle of an 'act' (v. 1081); it is but a matter of form, but it ought to be put right. What is Mr. Glazebrook's authority for his 'curtain' (see final note)?

Mr. Glazebrook mentions Wecklein's edition and mine as those which he has chiefly used. Of my conclusions he accepts so many that I have little to say. When we disagree, it is generally on a matter not proveable any way. If I pressed for reconsideration, it would be on vv. 137–8, 194, 487, 581, 888, 942, 963, 1346 (common numeration). The note on Peirene (v. 69) is not accurate; and the statement (v. 314) that 'in Greek tragedy when women speak of themselves in the plural they use the masculine gender' is carelessly worded; it should be of course (as in Mr. Heberden's note) 'when a woman speaks of herself' &c. On vv. 738–9 Mr. Glazebrook improves a suggestion of mine by one (ἀντίθοιο for ἀν' πίθοιο) which I should be glad to accept.

How far Mr. Heberden might agree with me I cannot say, for there is no reference in his book to any edition later than Wecklein's of 1880.

To the notes Mr. Heberden adds two Appendices: (1. *List of chief variations from the readings of the MSS.* 2. *On the Choral Metres*) and two Indices, Greek and English. The want of something answering to the first Appendix has been already noticed as a defect of Mr. Glazebrook's book. In the second Mr. Heberden has put very neatly and briefly as much about the general nature

¹ See the introduction to my smaller edition.

of the choral metres as his readers are likely to learn. Indeed his discretion in not attempting determinations for which there are no sufficient data might well be imitated in more ambitious works.

The German book is a text only, without explanatory notes. Below the text is a pretty full *apparatus criticus* of MS. readings and conjectures. With a class sufficiently advanced for critical work it might be used at the lesson; for preparation something else would of course be necessary. It is injured, I think, for its purpose by some strange licences. Surely it is not desirable to put into the text readings possible perhaps, but such as neither are established, nor are likely to be; as for instance at v. 11:—

ἀνδάνουσα μεν
[ὥπερ μεγίστων ἐκ πόνων σώτειρ' ἔφν]
φυγῇ πολιτῶν τῶνδ' ἀφίκετο χθόνα.

The verse in brackets is invented to stop a gap, which most people do not suppose to exist, and τῶνδ' for ὧν is an alteration, to say the least, very uncertain. For a critical lesson a doubtful passage like this should be printed as in the MSS.—At v. 155 we have

εἰ δὲ σὸς πόσις
καινὰ λέχη σεβίζει,
σοὶ τόδε μὴ χαράσσου.

The MS. κείνω τόδε is probably wrong, but to call κείνω 'a gloss' is purely arbitrary, and, if the learner believes it, will prevent him from understanding what a gloss really is; nor do I see how the amended text can properly be translated.—The suggestion of ὡς φίλ' ἐγὼ προσανῶ for ἔξω φίλα καὶ τὰδ' αὖδα (182) should have been made, if anywhere, certainly in the notes.—The interpretation of γιγνώσκειν καλῶς (228) as an infinitive absolute, before it is to be considered, must have better illustration than ὡς εἰπεῖν.—The best suggestion which I have noticed is κόρην for πατρός in 942 (943 spurious). But could σὴν κόρην mean 'thy bride'?—It would be a good service to print the *Medea*, or any part of Euripides, with a strictly conservative text and a complete *apparatus criticus*, in fact as Wecklein has printed Aeschylus. If the editor would bring his book nearer to this, it would, I think, be more useful than in its present shape.

A. W. VERRALL.

TEXTS OF CICERO.

M. Tulli Ciceronis libri qui ad rem publicam et ad philosophiam spectant; vol. ix. *Cato Maior de Senectute, Laelius de Amicitia*; 50 Pf. vol. x. *De Officiis*; 80 Pf. ed. Th. Schiche, Leipzig, Freytag.

M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes Selectae; vol. i. *Oratio pro Sex. Roscio Amerino*; 30 Pf. vol. ii. *In Q. Caecilium Divinatio, in C. Verrem Accusationis*, Lib. iv. v.; ed. H. Nohl; 80 Pf. Leipzig, Freytag.

THESE volumes are part of a *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum* now appearing under the general editorship of C. Schenkl, with whom at first J. Kvičala was associated. The series is especially intended for use in schools, and, for that purpose, will prove a formidable rival to the Teubner series of texts; for other purposes the two series do not come into competition. The volumes are printed in excellent type, and on paper pleasant to look at and to handle, though too thin, and the prices are extremely moderate. There is in each case a brief

introduction and a small *apparatus criticus* at the foot of the page, an advantage not possessed by the Teubner volumes, where the very full critical notes are placed apart from the text in the front of each volume. The editing is careful and competent. I have made a general examination of all the four books mentioned above, and have read carefully the editions of the *Cato Maior* and the *Laelius*. The names of the editors are well known to all who busy themselves with Ciceronian scholarship. It is a matter of course that opinions should differ as to the judgment exercised by an editor who is restricted to the selection of a very few topics for comment, whether the comment be critical or explanatory. The few criticisms therefore that I am about to offer must not be taken as detracting from the opinion I have already expressed as to the general value of the editions. Schiche has everywhere exercised sound and independent judgment. He is judiciously conservative and takes no notice of such extravagant *atheteses* as those put

forward by Lütjohann in a paper on the *Cato Maior* (*Rhein. Mus.* xxxvii.). Perhaps a few more indications might have been given as to the doubtfulness of MSS. readings which run counter to the ordinary grammar of Cicero. Thus *e.g.* in *Off.* 1, 73 *nil minus* is very properly corrected, after Wesenberg, to *nilo m.*, but in 1, 116 *orti maioribus*, in 2, 75 *leges proxumae quaeque*, and in 3, 106 *nequaeratur latebraperiurio* are left unnoticed; so too the subjunctive *agas* in *Cato Maior* § 27 (*deceat...quidquid agas agere pro viribus*) though very hard to justify, is left untouched.

Cato Maior § 4 *consolatio*: though this is the reading of the two best MSS., the context demands the *consolatione* of the secondary MSS.; Schiche has no n.—§ 13 *quarto nonagesimo anno*: the reading of P is more in accord with Cicero's usage than that of L, which inserts *et* after *quarto*.—§ 16 *etiam ipsius Appi extat oratio*: the MSS. reading is *et tamen*, and there is not the slightest reason for changing it. The sense is 'and apart from that,' 'and putting that aside,' and the usage is quite characteristic of Cicero; see the references in the note to the passage in my edition.—§ 27 *nec nunc quidem vires desidero adolescentis*: this compels us to take *nunc quidem* as = *νῦν γὰρ* 'now at least,' which has the effect of making Cato imply that he does expect to regret the loss of his youthful strength when he is a little older. As this is contrary to the whole drift of the context, it is necessary to read with some MSS. *ne nunc quidem*.—§ 28 *est decorus senis sermo quietus et remissus*: Madvig's *seni* is not mentioned, though much preferable; cf. *Plin. ep.* 3, 1, 2 *senibus placida omnia et ordinata conveniunt*.—§ 49 *mori videbamus in studio dimetiendi paene caeli C. Galum*: what sense can there be in saying 'we were accustomed to see C. Galus dying (by inches?) in his occupation of almost measuring out the sky?' MS. P omits *mori*; this in L has probably taken the place of *vivere* which fell out owing to the similarity of its first letters to those of *videbamus*. This suggestion has already been made by Iwan Müller, who refers to § 38 *in his studiis laboribusque viventi*.—§ 58 *natationes*: read without comment. As L has *acnationes* and P *nationes* with *ta* written over, my reading *uenationes* is as near to the MSS.; it is also more probable on other grounds.—§ 58 *id ipsum utrum libebit* (in a parenthesis): no note on this, though in Nauck, Sommerbrodt, and in my edition the difficulty of the reading is indicated. MS. P has *unum*. L *utrum*; both readings have arisen out of *ut* (which is in

the *editio Ascensiana*) to which *um* was added by dittographia from *ipsum*; the unintelligible *utum* then passed on the one hand into *unum*, on the other into *utrum*.—§ 73: in the bit from Ennius '*nemo me lacrumis decoret*' it is surprising to find no mention of Bergk's famous emendation '*dacrumis*.' Many scholars have raised doubts as to the true readings of the quotation from Ennius in § 14, but Schiche notices none of them.

J. S. REID.

M. Tulli Ciceronis Scripta quae remanserunt omnia. Recognovit C. F. W. MUELLER. Partis ii. vol. iii. Leipzig, Teubner, 1886. 2 Mk. 10.

MUELLER's edition of Cicero is one of the most considerable recent works in the field of critical Latin scholarship. For knowledge, skill, industry, and conscientiousness there are few living scholars who can be placed in comparison with him. He founds his text, in the minutest matters as well as in the greatest, on the widest study of the peculiarities of Ciceronian MSS., and the most intimate knowledge of Ciceronian and general Latin usage. His critical notes do not merely record various readings; frequently by laborious collections of examples and by apt quotations or by suitable exegesis they justify the selection he has made. The net result is a fairly conservative text; but suspicious Latin is very seldom allowed to pass without warning. The present volume contains the twenty-seven speeches (including the *pro Scauro* and *pro Marcello*) which come last in order of delivery. To the 569 pages of text there are 129 closely packed pages of critical notes. A minute review of such a work could only take the form of something like a new critical edition of the speeches with which the editor deals. A very little examination of the book will convince a competent reader of its high value; he will then place it on his shelves as an indispensable adjunct to Baiter and Halm (*Orelli ed.* 2). Mueller's edition does not entirely supersede this work, because, although he often uses MSS. which the former editors had not at hand, he has not space to give full collations. In connexion with many matters of Latinity affecting the text of other authors besides Cicero, Mueller provides material of great value. His own emendations are very few, and all of them simple and unpretentious. They are nearly all improvements on the readings of the MSS., but the passages are

generally of such a nature that it is possible to emend in many different and equally plausible ways. 'Facile est hariolari' says Mueller at one point, but it is often far from easy to urge cogent reasons in favour of one particular correction rather than others. In *Planc.* 91, Mueller's em. *recuso* for *desino* is really more probable than the ordinarily accepted *debeo*; *r* was first miswritten *d*, and the word then altered to the nearest compound verb with *de*;—a kind of error to which there are a good many parallels. In § 45 again, *bonorum omnium odium*, the word *odium* is a better correction of *vim* than *iram*; for *odium* being like *omnium* excepting one letter would easily fall out and be replaced by *vim*, and *ira* is generally used by Cicero either of the gods 'who do well to be angry,' or of reprehensible human passion; it is moreover rare in the speeches. Mueller is right in objecting to the phrase *oppido desperare* as un-Ciceronian in *Pis.* 84 *Thessalonicenses, cum oppido desperassent, munire arcem coeperunt*, but *de oppido* would be a more probable change than *oppido se defensores*.

I cannot follow our editor in his tendency to change *all* instances of *me te se* dependent on the genitive of the gerund, to *mei tui sui*. The accusative is, as is well known, a somewhat archaic usage. Can any one who has paid close attention to the rhythm and collocation of words in the Ciceronian sentence believe that *tui* was written in *De Orat.* 2, § 16: *ita sum cupidus in illa longiore te ac perpetua disputatione audiendi ut...*? Somewhat similar considerations apply to conjectures such as *salute danda* in *Lig.* § 9 for *salutem dando*.

A systematic and deliberate editor like Mueller naturally gets from time to time a little impatient with the 'glossematum venatores' as he once calls them, and he now and then cannot refrain from sarcastically indicating to them some prey which they have failed to mark. If one-tenth of the passages pounced on by the gloss-hunters as spurious were really so, then the gloss-makers were the most ingenious men of whom history has left any record. The art of constructing phrases which could be used like wedges to drive apart and yet hold tight the words of the real text must have been one of inconceivable nicety. A patient examination of the text of Cicero conducted by a competent scholar who has read and re-read his author from end to end must lead to a conviction that the deliberate interpolations are very few and far between, and that the number of those which are due to accident is in-

definitely smaller than has been supposed by a large number of recent critics. Some of Mueller's remarks bearing on this subject are much to the point. On a proposal to eject some words in *Sest.* § 6 he exclaims: 'miram sedulitatem hominum talia inculcantium!' Here again is a lesson much needed by the critics of Cicero's text who will not see to what shifts an advocate with a bad case must needs be sometimes driven: 'quam inani verborum sonitu, quam futtili ac paene absurdo argumentandi genere saepe Cic. usus est, credere nolunt viri docti.' Again: 'si ita scripsit Cic., non laudo, sed multo tamen melius scripsisse contendo quam quae viri docti substituerunt.'

The following remarks concern entirely the *Pro Sestio* and the *Pro Balbo*, speeches which I have had occasion to study minutely and recently. The consideration of the *Pro Sestio* brings home the fact, too often forgotten, that Cicero has, even in his speeches, many markedly different styles. What greater contrast could there be than that between the laboured, mechanical and rhetorical, but often grand, rolling and imposing periods of the *Pro Sestio*, and the brief, pointed, pithy sentences of the *Second Philippic*, which make straight for the throat of the antagonist (to use a pleasant phrase not uncommon in the ancient rhetorical schools)? Those critics who will not take account of contrasts such as these must of necessity often go astray. The speech for Sestius was evidently written and re-written and corrected a score of times over, and the uneasy conscience of the author has clouded it with obscurity and artificiality.

Sest. § 5 *si modo id consequi potero*. Müller wishes to insert *dicendo* before *consequi*, but the phrase as it stands is a set one and recurs frequently with slight variations, such as the omission of *id* or the substitution of *potuero* for *potero*. Five exx. are given in my n. on *Acad.* 1, § 8; of course *Imp. Cn. P.* § 2 *si quid in dicendo consequi possum* is different.

§ 16 *omni inaudita libidine insani*, MSS.; for the last word *exsanguis* (adopted by M.), *infamis*, *exhausti*, *enervati* etc. have been conjectured. Rather *insanientis*.

§ 17 *proditores*: I still hold *perditores* to be a necessary alteration, for reasons given by me in Dr. Holden's edition *ad loc.* The admirable work of Dr. Holden seems not to have been in Mueller's hands.

§ 22 *sermonis ansas dabat*: there seems to be no reason why *sermonis* (altered by M. and most edd.) should not stand as a defining genitive to *ansas*.

§ 24 ita domus ipsa fumabat ut multa eius sermonis indicia redolerent: read *sermone sane digna redoleret*.

§ 42 effusam illam ac superatam Catilinae...manum: M. with nearly all editors changes *superatam*; but surely Cicero may be allowed to speak of Catiline's force as having been 'routed and overcome,' as he speaks elsewhere of a fleet having been 'conquered and overcome' (vieta atque superata, *Verr.* 2, 5, 98). Whether he wrote *effundere manum* for *fundere* is far more doubtful, though the question is, I think, unnoticed by the editors. *Effusam* probably is for *ecfusam*, and the *ec* is a dittographia of the *et* which precedes it. So in § 91 *ex feritate* passed into *ex eferitate* and *ex efferitate*.

§ 50 ille (Marius) vitam suam...ad rei publicae fatum reservavit: *fatum* is the generally accepted emendation of Pantagathus for *ratum*; but *rectionem* (which I conjectured *ap.* Holden) gives better sense and would easily, by the dropping of the *c*, and the writing of the final syllables by contraction, pass into *ratum*. *Rectio* is twice joined with the gen. of *res publica* elsewhere in Cic.

§ 70 Lentulus...causam suscepit: Mueller in an excellent note defends *causam* 'the cause' against Halm who reads *meam causam*. His defence of the greatly disputed words in the next §, viz. *ingredior iam* in *Sesti tribunatum*, is equally good.

§ 77 comodo aliquo proposito (not in MSS.) aut largitione: rather insert *ostentata* after *largitione*, comparing *Leg. agr.* 2, § 10.

ib. nulla contione advocata, nulla lata lege concitata nocturnam seditionem quis audivit? *Lata* is not in the MSS. and is unsuitable for the reason I urged in Dr. Holden's edition, that the turmoil might be expected to arise before the law was passed or while it was being passed, not after it had passed. Either *recitata* (in the codex Gemblacensis) or *promulgata* (Lambinus) is preferable.

§ 84 quid uti faceret? senatum obsideret...? Certainly *ut* must have fallen out after *senatum*.

§ 110 nihil saneate libelli: this, the reading of P, points to *nihil sani e libellis*; with the *e* was combined a variant *a*, and *ae* altered to *a te*. I do not see why Mueller should take account of the words *invabant anagnostae* inserted before *libelli* in some recent corrected MSS., which lead him to the conjecture *nihil suavitates invabant anagnostae*. I am glad to see that he

defends *philosophorum reculam* in the same §.

§ 133 ut illius meae proscriptionis.. tubam Vatinium, sese scriptorem esse diceret: *tubam Vatinium*, *sese* is an acute em. of M. for the *toumbuam essese* or other like nonsense of the MSS., and I have no doubt that the idea of it, if not the precise form, is right. M. does not quote *Fam.* 6, 12, 3 *tuba belli ciuilis* (applied to *venia*).

§ 137 splendorem confirmare: this is the conjecture of Bake, adopted by Mueller tacitly. It is one of the few instances of any importance in which he has abandoned the MSS. without indicating the fact. *Senatum proximorum ordinum splendore confirmari voluerunt* is really better Latin and more likely to have been written by Cic. than the correction.

Pro Balbo § 3 recte se dare: M. adopts this conj. of Madvig, but I am convinced that *omnia recte se dant* is not Ciceronian Latin; see the note in my edition, p. 102, which was not in Mueller's hands while his text was being printed; but he courteously quotes it in his preface.

§ 5 Carthagine esse opsessum: M. adopts (as I did) this em. of Madvig, but without comment. The reading to which the MSS. point is *Carthaginem isse possessum*, and this may after all be right. *Possidere* is certainly used of lands or places taken from the enemy; cf. *e.g.* *Mur.* 34 *posse regno*; *Tac. An.* 14, 21 *Achaia, Asia...possessa*; *Plin. n.h.* 4, 39 *toto oriente possesso*. For the supine with *ire* cf. *Cic. Att.* 8, 4, 3 *Brundisium ire desertum* (of Pompey); *Caes. b.g.* 5, 26, 2 *Treveri magna manu ad castra oppugnatum venerunt* (where the *ad* should probably be ejected). But it may be urged that though the general or the whole army may be said to have proceeded to occupy Carthage, the phrase is not suited to an individual of inferior rank. Velleius, however, says of one of his ancestors (2, 16, 2): *tantam fidem praestitit ut...Herculaneum cum T. Didio caperet, Pompeios cum L. Sulla oppugnaret, Comp-samque occuparet*. Even if *possessum* were changed to *opsessum*, I should prefer to keep *Carthaginem isse*, comparing *Sall. Jug.* 103, 1 *Marius proficiscitur in loca sola opsessum turrim regiam*. I may mention that there is no record in the historians of any siege of Carthago nova at the time indicated, which must be (if Cic. can be trusted) prior to the battles of the Suero and the Turia. Nor is it likely from the circumstances of the war that any such siege took place. Possibly *Carthaginem* is an error for *Calagurrim*. The forces of Pompeius did besiege this town

just before the battles (Liv. *Epit.* 93) but were driven away by the Sertorians.

§ 6 *pietas in rem publicam*: this conjecture (for *tas in etc.* of MSS.) which I put forward in my edition, has, I am glad to see, been arrived at and adopted independently by Mueller.

§ 11 *ille ille vir*: Madvig. on the strength of inferior MSS. ejected one *ille* and Mueller follows him wrongly. The repetition is quite in Cicero's style, as is shown by Jordan on Caecin. § 14.

§ 26 *nihil magis* (Lambinus for *nihil m.*): Mueller is right in adopting this; Cicero no more said *nihil magis* than he did *multum magis*; nor, I may say, did any other Latin writer of repute; see my note on *Acad.* 2, § 58. *Nihil minus* has been generally abandoned in *Off.* 1, § 72; that passage and this are, I believe, the only two in Cicero where good MSS. give *nihil* with a comparative.

§ 39 *qui...ab omni studio sensuque Poenorum mentes suas ad nostrum imperium nomenque flexerunt*: I venture to think that these much disputed words are given correctly in the MSS. Why may not *sensus Poenorum* mean 'feeling for their fellow-Punians,' if Cicero can write, as he does, *virtutis certamen* for *certamen contra virtutem*, and *dissensio huius ordinis* for *d. ab hoc ordine*? So Justin 29, 4, 5 has *Romanorum bella* for *bella in Romanos*. For the general drift cf. Val. M. 7, 3, 7 *animum suum a Poenis ad Romanos coegit revocare*; Liv. 5, 42, 8 *abalienaverant ab sensu rerum suarum animos*.

§ 47 *si tanta bella attigisset quanta gessit et confecit* (sc. Marius): *attigisset* is an infelicitous correction of *egisset*. I have not the slightest doubt that the old em. *legisset* is correct; there is an allusion to the tradition that Marius used to pour ridicule on the generals who learned their art from books. See Sallust *Jug.* 85, and the references in my note on *Acad.* 2, § 2.

ib. *a re publica bene gerenda impediretur*: I cannot think it possible (as Mueller does), that Cic. would construct *impedire* with the simple ablative, omitting the preposition.

§ 48 *cum...quaestio venisset*: the use of *venire* 'to come about' (in other than future tenses) to which Mueller objects, is rare but well attested; cf. *Imp. Pomp.* 15 *cum venit calamitas* (left unchanged by M.). The passage given by Georges: '*haec ubi veniunt*' seems to come from *Verr.* 2, 5, 12 where the best MSS. have *eveniunt*.

ib. *ternos: treceños* is proposed by Ihne *Hist.* V. 163 (Eng. ed.), not noticed by M. Ihne's long argument seems to me baseless.

§ 50 *Avennensem foederatum*: for the unintelligible *Avennensem* I propose *Vasiensem*, a word which occurs in inscriptions to designate a citizen of Vasio, one of the two chief towns of the Gaulish Vocontii, who were certainly *foederati*. *Viennensem*, of which I formerly thought, will not do because the Allobroges were *dediticii* not *foederati* (Liv. *epit.* 61, Strabo 4, p. 203).

J. S. REID.

THE VIENNA CORPUS SCRIPTORUM ECCLESIASTICORUM LATINORUM.

I.

Eugippii. *Excerpta ex Operibus S. Augustini*, ed. P. Knoell, Vienna, 1885. 22 Mk.

It is a striking proof of the immense resources of Germany that, besides all the activity expended upon the Classics in the stricter sense, there should be carried on at one and the same time three such undertakings as the *Vienna Corpus Script. Eccles. Lat.*, the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, and the collection of materials for *Latin Lexicography* in Professor Wölfflin's *Archiv*. It is true that the last-mentioned, after being conducted for three years on a subsidy from the Munich Academy of £25 per annum, seems to be on the point of expiring;

NOS. V. & VI. VOL. I.

but the wonder is rather that it should have gone on so long as it has. An Englishman cannot help asking what we have at all parallel to any one of these enterprises. I am afraid that Dr. Murray's great *Dictionary* is all that we can show; and that belongs to a different sphere. Yet systematic undertakings of this kind react upon the nation that gives birth to them. Besides the positive results obtained, they serve to train and practise a whole army of collators and editors who are ready to turn their hands to anything, and who have gained their experience not at second-hand or by mere theorising, but by direct work at MSS. and texts. In saying this I do not of course mean to imply that I regard the Germans as infallible: the present article

will show that I do not: but they at least make the best use of their *personnel*.

The *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* is to South Germany very much what the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* are to North. It was planned rather more than twenty years ago by the Vienna Academy on the most comprehensive scale. The writings which it was proposed to edit were those of the Latin Fathers down to the seventh century. Competent scholars were sent out to examine the contents of the different European libraries, so as to see what MSS. were available. The result has been a series of reports, the first of which was, I believe, that by Halm on the libraries of Switzerland in 1865, with a supplement by Morel in 1867. In 1870 and 1871 came out in two volumes Reifferscheid's elaborate account of his explorations in Italy. Compared with this the report by Zangemeister on England, which appeared in 1877, was rather slight and perfunctory. The last report, that on the Spanish libraries, has been published within the last few weeks after having previously appeared in the *Sitzungsberichte*. It is edited by Hartel from materials mainly collected by that promising scholar, whose early decease was so much to be regretted, G. Loewe. France was also included in the original programme, but no report on the French libraries has yet been issued: so much excellent work has been done of late in the way of cataloguing by the French themselves that any foreign report might well be thought unnecessary.

These reports formed a sort of chart to direct the labours of the scholars who undertook the task of collating and editing. The series of published volumes was opened with Sulpicius Severus by Halm, which appeared in 1866. It has been followed since that time by thirteen more—counting the second part of Eugippius, and the three parts of Cyprian as single works. At the end of the list comes the so-called *Speculum* of S. Augustine which is only just out.

Compared with the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* the Vienna volumes are not quite so sumptuous and exhaustive, but they have the advantage of being handier and cheaper. It may be mainly due to natural development, but it is also perhaps in part owing to a generous rivalry that in the later issues the indices and prefaces have become fuller and more complete. Many of the editors have taken occasion from time to time to give a detailed account of their critical procedure in the *Sitzungsberichte* or *Transactions* of the Vienna Academy. The series has also led

to the production of valuable essays on the language of the authors edited, as by Engelbrecht on Claudianus Mamertus in the *Sitzungsberichte* for 1885, and by Hartel on Lucifer Calaritanus in the last volume of the *Archiv f. lat. Lexikographie*.

Critics are rather in the habit of complaining that the writings which have so far been published, with the single exception of Cyprian, all belong to the second or third rank: the texts of Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, Hilary, Tertullian, are still advertised as in the stage of 'preparation.' But we may well be grateful for what we have got, and leave the editors to take their own time. Many considerations determine the rate at which it is possible to issue the works of any particular author, even supposing that all the editors had the same amount of time at their disposal. For instance, it was one thing to edit Lucifer from a single MS. in a volume of some 330 pages, and another thing to edit Eugippius' *Excerpts from S. Augustine* which extend to 1,100 pages, and for which there are more MSS. than any editor was likely to collate. However, the line is now rapidly lengthening, and the volumes have of late appeared in such quick succession that we may hope to receive some of the greater works before long.

I propose in the articles of which this is the first, to notice some of the more recent volumes, not necessarily in the order in which they have appeared, and also not necessarily in any order of interest. In this respect the book which is now before me—substantial as it is—may not appear very promising. There is none which has met with so grudging a reception. Eugippius' *Excerpts from S. Augustine* are of course at best only a secondary work. Their popularity in the Middle Ages, which is evidenced by the number of MSS. that have come down to us, was naturally accounted for by the convenience of having the cream of S. Augustine's bulky tomes in a single volume. The works of S. Augustine circulated in sections, but even so it is a wonder that the endurance of the scribes was equal to the task of transmitting them to posterity. We can imagine that Eugippius must have earned a large debt of gratitude by compressing these into the equivalent of 1,100 printed pages. And yet the extracts are not such as we should make now, and they are not likely to be much used for their original purpose. Their real interest lies in the help which they afford towards reconstructing the text of S. Augustine. We

will reserve our remarks on the personality of Eugippius until we come to speak of the *Vita S. Severini*, his other extant work. Suffice it to say at present that his *Selections* were probably made within a hundred years of the death of S. Augustine; so that by bringing out a revised text of Eugippius the Vienna editors have thrown up, as it were, an advanced work from which to lay siege to the great African.

The MSS. which Knoell has used for his edition are these:

- A* = Cod. Ambrosianus, saec. ix., two rather long fragments.
- D* = Cod. Desnoyersii, saec. viii., about half the work.
- G* = Cod. Sangallensis, saec. ix., the whole.
- M* = Cod. Cheltenhamensis (Mediomontanus), saec. viii., all but complete.
- P* = Cod. Parisinus (Sangermanensis), saec. ix., complete as it stands, but with a few pages made up by the next MS., *Q*.
- Q* = the six last leaves of *P* which really belonged to another MS. of about the same date.
- T* = Cod. Parisinus (Tellerianus), saec. ix., like *D*, about half the work.
- V* = Cod. Vaticanus, saec. vii., the whole except a small portion at the beginning and end.
- v* = Cod. Vercellensis, saec. x., nearly the whole.

Knoell makes slight use of two other MSS. and gives an account of some more. Among these is a Bodleian MS. of the ninth century, which Knoell dismisses as *nullius in momentis*. I was anxious to test this, but unfortunately the MS. contains only the latter half of the *Extracts*, and the quarter-nion, which should have contained the passages from the *De Civitate* which I have used as a criterion, is missing.

Of the MSS. just enumerated several have an interest quite apart from their text. *T*, from the beauty of its execution, is one of the exhibited specimens in the Bibliothèque Nationale: *V* is also highly praised for its calligraphy. *D* was made the subject of a most instructive memoir (*Notice sur un Manuscrit Mérovingien d'Eugippius*, Paris, 1875) by the accomplished librarian M. Léopold Delisle. It is one of the best typical examples of Merovingian writing, as it contains a number of different hands—uncial, half-uncial, minuscule, and cursive. The fragment *Q* has a subscription which

has attracted much attention. This has evidently been handed on from the original from which *Q* itself was copied. We gather that the MS. to which it relates was written by Peter the notary for Redux, Bishop of Naples, in the year 581 A.D., while the Lombards were besieging the city of Naples.

What use, it will be asked, has Knoell made of these materials? The reply to this question will naturally touch upon four points: (1) the selection of MSS., (2) the collations, (3) the principles followed in the construction of the text, (4) the bearing of the text so constructed upon that of S. Augustine.

The MSS. fall into two strongly-marked groups, *MQV* on the one side, *DGPTv* on the other: *A* alone seems to stand somewhat apart, though as its text is not extant along with *T*, I have not made it the subject of close analysis. Now of these MSS. *M* is simply a direct copy of *V*, and Knoell believes that *v* was copied (apparently at one or two degrees' remove) from the same original as *G*. It is true that *M* is of use in helping to discard the corrections of *V*, which had not been made when it was written, and *v* performs a like office in regard to *G*, with the first corrector of which it is closely allied. Still I cannot but think that some of the labour (by no means slight) which has been spent on these two MSS., *M* and *v*, might have been spared. There are two ways in which the economy might have been utilised. It is part of the general plan of reducing, as much as possible, the *apparatus criticus* in the Vienna series, that the authorities are usually cited on one side only. This is, however, often unsatisfactory. It is a precarious method to leave the reader to infer readings *ex silentio*. This must of course be done in many cases, if the volumes are to be kept down to a moderate size and price, but it would have been a decided advantage if these cases had been fewer than they are. Or, on the other hand, in place of *M* and *v*, it might, perhaps, have been possible to find a MS. representing a more distinct type of text, the combination of which with the other MSS. might have been helpful. The mechanical rule of drawing a line at the tenth century is sure to lead to regrettable omissions.

There is another point on which I cannot quite satisfy myself as to the method of collation. No doubt great allowance must be made for an editor who has collated—not everywhere but very largely—as many as nine MSS. for a text covering 1,100 pages. So long as we know what MSS. are being

collated, and what inferences may be drawn from silence, all is well. But this is not always the case. Knoell says expressly that he has collated *G* for the first twenty-nine chapters; and citations of *G* are often very frequent. But on pp. 150–155 *G* is not cited at all; on p. 154 it is cited twice; on pp. 157–164 it is again not cited, and on p. 165 it is again cited twice; yet it does not appear that there are *lacunae* in the MS. What are we to make of this? The student who wants to determine the exact relation of *G* to *DPTv* finds himself baffled.

The main question, however, of course is that as to the construction of the text. Knoell refers to his intention to explain the principles of his procedure elsewhere. I have not been able to ascertain whether this intention has been fulfilled. Knoell has based his text mainly upon *V*, which certainly has a *prima facie* case in its favour. It is by a little the oldest of the MSS.: it has preserved some spellings like *Vergilius*, and still more vernacular forms—*de non fuerit, erat de, quinta triena*—which seem to have been lost in the other MSS.: and it

gets the benefit of the subscription in *Q* which must have been taken from a MS. of the same type. And yet there is, I cannot but think, one serious difficulty to be got over—a difficulty with which I cannot feel sure that Knoell has thoroughly grappled.

In seeking to check the text of Eugippius one naturally goes first to S. Augustine, and in particular to that treatise which has had at least a preliminary critical edition, the *De Civitate* of Dombart (Leipzig, 1877). The MSS. used by Dombart are nearly as old as those of Eugippius: *V* is of cent. vii., (*C*, which is also of cent. vii., is unfortunately only extant in a passage corresponding to one short extract in Eugippius), *K* is of cent. viii., *F* of cent. ix., *AR* of cent. x. Now on comparing the text of these MSS. with the MSS. of Eugippius I find that they constantly support the group *DGPTv* against *MV* which Knoell has followed. I will give in parallel columns some of the results of this comparison, showing what MSS. of Eugippius agree with the text or leading MSS. of Augustine:

EUGIPPIUS ED. KNOELL.

- p. 52, 25, autem
53, 26, uoluptatem
54, 1, quia
3, enim *MV*
55, 22, litteras sacras
56, 14, redemptionem
18, refrigescit = Aug. *cod. V*
atque ita = Lat. Vet. *cod. f*, Matt. xxiv. 12
22, decipimus, *MV*
57, 10, temptationibus uariis
16, gloriabitur
58, 2, timorem
20, eas
24, dixit
59, 7, expectamus
26, atque iustorum multumque sanctorum
27, quia
77, 14, est *sine abilit.*
78, 2, ex mortuis
25, atque, *MT*
151, 24, requies
156, 3, maior
159, 1, fecit Deus
7, aut impossibile
10, priorum
11, Dei uerbo
172, uoluntatem aliquam
173, 20, affectos
174, 12, quia
175, 1, specie
23, pulchritudinis suauium corporum, *MT*
176, 7, deriuatur, *MTU*
23, illo, *MT*
177, 2, ille eos
178, 1, mortaliter, *MT* = Aug. *cod. A*, *ed. Paris*.

De Civitate ED. DOMBART.

- ergo = Eugip. *codl. DGPTv*
uoluptates = *D²GPTr*
quae = *DGPTr*
autem = *DGPTr*
sacras litteras = *DGPTr*
redemptionem = *DGPTr*
refrigescet (*Domb.*) = *P²T*
atque ita = Lat. Vet. *codl. abd²c*, Matt. xxiv. 12
seducimus = *DGPTr*
temptationes uarias = *P¹PT*
glorietur = *DGPTr*
timores = *DGPTr*
om. = *DGPTr*
dixerit = *DGPTr*
speramus = *DGPTr*
multumque iustorum atque sanctorum = *DGPTr*
quoniam = *DGPTr*
add. mediator bonus = *DGPTr*
et ex mortuis = *P²Tr*
et = *DGPTr*
et requies (Aug. *cod. V*; sed *Domb.*) = *PTr*
longe maior = *PTr*
Deus fecit = *PTr*
aut etiam impossibile = *PTr*
priores = *PTr*
uerbo Dei = *PTr*
aliquam uoluntatem = *PTr*
affectos fuisse = *PTr*
qui (Aug. *codl. VA*, *Domb.*) = *PTr*
in specie = *PTr*
pulchrorum suauiumque corporum *PTr*
deprauatur = *P²T*
ab illo = *PTr*
eos ille = *PTr*
Mutabiliter (Aug. *codl. VG*, *Domb.*) = *P(T)v*

Our attention is caught by the coincidence of Knoell's reading *refrigescit*, p. 56, 18 with

that of the Italic text represented by *f* (Cod. Brixianus), and we at once remember

the well-known passage in which Augustine expressed a preference for that text. Too much stress, however, must not be laid upon this point. S. Augustine's Bible is a very variable quantity, and by his time the Latin texts had been much mixed. I have not as yet formulated any conclusion as to the text used in the *De Civitate*. There are certainly Italic readings, such as *glorificent* in the quotation of Matt. v. 16, *recordatus* in the quotation of Matt. v. 23. But there are also readings which are not Italic: e.g. *mundo corde* (from Matt. v. 8 = Lat. Vet. Codd. a, b), seems to have better attestation in both the places where it occurs, as against *mundi corde* of *f*. Another reading where there might seem to be a certain presumption in favour of Knoell's text is *deriuatur* in 176, 7, where the editor aptly compares the use of *deriuatio* in Victor Vitensis and Orosius: yet here too the MSS. of Augustine

unanimously present *deprauatur*, and it is equally possible that *deriuatur* may be a paraphrastic expression introduced in the process of copying. Whichever type of text is the genuine Eugippius, evidently by Eugippius himself or by a subsequent scribe such paraphrasing must have taken place to a considerable extent. In most of the other instances that are not simply ambiguous I should have thought that, even apart from the evidence of the MSS. of Augustine, the internal probabilities were rather against the text adopted by Knoell.

It is right to set down on the other side those readings in the passages previously analysed in which Codd. *PTv* &c. of Eugippius differ from the MSS., or from Dombart's text of Augustine. For a reason which I shall state presently I only give those combinations into which *T* enters.

EUGIPPII codd. *PTV*, &c.

p. 53, 6, Virgilius, *D¹GMPTv* (cf. p. 487, 11, v, p. 538, 3, *GPTv*)
16, suscipiunt, *DGP(T)v*

54, 2, caliginosis, *G²Tv*

57, 14, percant, *D¹GPTv*

[There is some confusion and mixed agreement and disagreement of the different texts here.]

58, 8, sui, *DGPTr*, Knoell; ei, *Mv*

16, actiones, *DG¹PTv*

59, 19, contigit, *PT*

77, 23, beatitudine, *D¹T²*

156, 18, aereum, *PTv*

172, 26, sed si superior *PTv* = Aug. ed. Paris.

174, 27, uellet, *P²T*

32, scire, *P¹Tv*

175, 23, luxuria, *PT* (cf. *Speculum Augustini*, p. 639, 14, ex *Ep. Jac.* v. 5)

[One or two instances of the omission or insertion of final *m* have not been noted on either side.]

There will hardly, I think, be any question which of these two lists is the more important. Nor can it, I imagine, any more be doubted that on the whole the text of *PTv* and their allies is nearer to that of the MSS. of Augustine than the text of *MV*. But considering that the work of Eugippius is professedly a reproduction of Augustine's text it seems to me distinctly more probable that those MSS. of Eugippius are right which are in agreement with that text. The only other possibilities are (1) that the Augustine MSS. on their side are all corrupt—which may be practically dismissed; or (2) that the copies used by Eugippius within a hundred years of the death of S. Augustine were already corrupt or were dealt with freely by Eugippius,

De Civitate ed DOMBART.

Vergilius = Knoell

suspiciunt = Knoell (dispiciunt Verg. codd. [despiciunt codd. opt.; respiciunt codd.])

caliginosi = Knoell

pereunt = Knoell

om.

affectiones = Eugip. codd. *G²v*, Knoell

contingit = Knoell

beatitudini = Knoell

aerium = Knoell

sed superior = Knoell

uelit = Knoell

sciri = Knoell

luxuria = Knoell

and that a later copy—the parent MS. of *DGPTv* which may well have been as old as the ancestor of *MV*—was systematically corrected into agreement with the Augustine MSS. The first half of this second alternative is possible enough in either of its forms: the history of the text of the New Testament shows that a hundred years is quite long enough to let in a great amount of corruption; and an editor like Eugippius would be, perhaps, more likely to resort to paraphrase than a scribe who was trained to copy mechanically what he had before him. But the further assumption which is necessary to complete this alternative, that the text of Eugippius was deliberately harmonised with that of Augustine, seems to me by no means probable. So far as I have

been able to judge, the phenomena are the same all through Eugippius; but if so, the corrector must have had access to a complete collection of the works of S. Augustine, which must have been in itself an exceptional thing; and then we must remember that he would have no such convenient indices and cross references as those with which Knoell has supplied us. It may, of course, have been done for all that, as Knoell assures us that it has been done by

Codd. MV.

p.	52, 27, corrumpere et
	52, 25, sicut ipse
	58, 8, ei
	52, 20, aphantia, <i>GMVc</i>
	7, 20, peruentionibus gradus
	148, 2, quidquid
	149, 8, uocationis, <i>MVr</i>
	150, 26, die <i>gen. cf. Cypr. ed. Hartel ind.</i>
	171, 20, initium
	25, uoluntate
	174, 4, quas
	8, consentit
	176, 21, noluisse

I do not like to speak at all confidently without a more prolonged study than I have been able to give. All that I have done has been to sink a few shafts into the text here and there, and set the results before the reader. If Knoell has not yet published his promised essay, he would perhaps himself take account of the considerations here put forward. It is true that in several places he refers to the text of Augustine, and in some makes use of it to support his own text, but I cannot be sure that he has formed a clear, well-reasoned conception of the relation of the two texts to each other. It seems to me that such a conception was essential to the formation of a trustworthy text.

I will venture to throw out a single suggestion for what it is worth. In the course of the above analysis I have been led to suspect that the most constant element in the preferable readings was *T'*, and that combinations of *T'* with another MS. had special claims to consideration. Against this it may be urged that *T'* has interpolations—that is, it continues the extracts a little further—in caps. xxv., lxxxvi., clxi., and adds a new heading in clvi. In the first two places *T'* stands alone; in the greater part of the third it is combined with *GP*, and in the fourth with *GPv*. But I do not wish to lay stress on the singular readings of *T'*, which do not appear to have any special value, so much as on *T'* in combination with other MSS.: where, as is

the third corrector of *G*, but one hesitates to assume such a hypothesis without strong reason, and the instances in which *PT'* &c. do not agree with the Augustine text all tell against it.

A further argument to the same effect would be supplied by those instances—not a few—in which Knoell himself has had to abandon his chosen guides, *MV*. I have noted the following in the passages analysed:

KNOELL.

corpore
sicuti se <i>DGPTr</i>
sui, <i>DGPTr</i>
ἀπάθεια apathia, <i>PT</i>
peruentionis gradus
quid
uocationis
diei, <i>PTv</i>
uitium
uoluntatem
quae
consensit, <i>PTv</i>
noluisse

frequently the case in some parts, it goes over to *MV*, it seems to me to carry with it the preponderance to the other side. This is only a *prima facie* view, but it might perhaps be worth testing.

In regard to our last point, the reflex influence which this edition of Eugippius may be expected to have on the text of S. Augustine, it is clear that this influence will be considerable, and that for fixing the text of S. Augustine, Knoell's digest of the readings of the MSS. of Eugippius will be of high importance. A few instances strike me at once where we may correct Dombart's text: we must remove the brackets from *absit* in p. 524, l. 16; we must restore *singula* for *singuli*, p. 620, 15, and read *facturas* for *victuras*, p. 621, 4. Whatever may be the true reading in S. Augustine—I have little doubt that in Eugippius, p. 58, 16 we ought to read *actiones*, and I am not at all sure that this is not what S. Augustine himself wrote. Outside the *De Civitate* the Vienna Eugippius is the nearest approach which we possess to a critical edition of S. Augustine.

Fortunately a good *apparatus criticus* is independent of the text which stands above it, and though I have freely expressed my doubts on the subject of Knoell's text, I am none the less grateful to him for the long, and I fear dreary, toil which this edition must have cost him.

W. SANDAY.

PALAEOGRAPHY IN FRANCE.

Album Paléographique ou Recueil de Documents importants relatifs à l'Histoire et à la Littérature nationales avec des notices explicatives par la Société de l'École des Chartes. Paris: Maison Quantin, 1887. 150 francs.

THERE is no study more indebted to photography than the study of palaeography. The facsimiles of MSS. of all ages which have been produced during the last twenty years by the improved methods of permanent photographic printing now form a body of material so extensive in range, and generally so excellent in execution, that a road to a knowledge of the subject lies open to the student in a royal manner which would be the envy of those who struggled with the hand-made facsimiles of other days—those facsimiles often mere grotesque imitations of the originals, and, if of better design, scanty in number and high in price. When one turns over the facsimiles given, for example, in such a work as the *Nouveau Traité de Diplomatie*, one wonders how any one could pretend to derive any accurate ideas from their study. Indeed it may be doubted whether, in those days, any one who had not access to a library of MSS. could possibly learn more than simple rudiments from such works. Now everything in this respect is changed. Facsimiles which can be trusted as the very shadows of the originals are now within reach of all who choose to hold out their hands for them, and palaeography may be studied at ease. And the material will go on accumulating—not only in the production of single pages as specimens of handwriting in particular countries at particular periods, but in the reproduction of entire volumes for purposes of textual criticism.

In the Introduction to the work before us the writer, M. Léopold Delisle, the director of the Bibliothèque Nationale, sketches out what has been done in this direction in the several countries of Europe during recent years. It is satisfactory to see that England is not behindhand in such work. He truly remarks that reproduction in facsimile is destined to develop to an extent which we scarcely yet appreciate. We are not content now-a-days to accept the readings of a printed text without question. We wish to know the readings of the best MSS.; and it will in the end be found easier to make the MSS.—in

facsimile—come before the world, than that the world should go to consult the MSS. Hitherto this has been found a somewhat expensive process; such facsimile editions have often been necessarily issued by subscription, and subscriptions have not been always forthcoming in spontaneous readiness. In the infancy of things there is always this struggle; but I would appeal to those happy bodies, corporations which do not die, libraries which never break up, to support such efforts and add to their stores these facsimile-books which must in the future be true books of reference. It may be safely predicted that an increasing stimulus will be given to the application of photography to the reproduction of texts on a scale not hitherto dreamt of. Photography can never hope to compete with the printing-press in cheapness, but it will one day compete with the copyist; and in cases where entire MSS. are of sufficient importance to require their texts to be published with perfect accuracy, copyist and printing-press must inevitably be superseded by the camera. And once let there be sufficient demand, prohibitive prices will vanish. There is no reason why the best classical texts should not thus be reproduced—a scheme which has been proposed more than once. Energy, perseverance, and above all the timely assistance of those corporate bodies whose aid has been invoked, would soon settle the matter. We have indeed made a beginning—the Hellenic Society has published a facsimile edition of the *Laurentian Sophocles*; but it is whispered that there are still copies unsubscribed for which might be standing on the accessible shelves of college libraries.

France is happy in having an École des Chartes, a school in which young men have the opportunity of receiving a practical training in palaeographical subjects, which gives them the power of deciphering ancient records, and fosters a taste for the study of documents connected with the general history of their country and of the minuter details connected with its topography and family history. The *Album Paléographique* is the result of the collaboration of certain members of this school. It consists of fifty plates, with descriptive letter-press, representing MSS. preserved, with two exceptions, in the libraries of France. They cover a long period, ranging from the fifth or sixth century down to the close of the seventeenth

century. At first sight this seems too long. One would object that, for practical purposes, a collection of fifty plates were better restricted within narrower limits. But we are told that this is only a first instalment of what, if carried out, will be an extensive work illustrating the progress of writing, particularly that of France, as developed in successive ages. This reconciles us to finding within the same covers a facsimile of the Paris Prudentius at one end, and the Declaration of the French Clergy in 1682 at the other. And it may be presumed that it is with a view to a final arrangement in one great series, when the issue shall be complete, that the plates in the *Album* are without numbers — certainly a temporary inconvenience.

The first plate, as already noticed, is drawn from the MS. of the poems of Prudentius, written in rustic capital letters at the end of the fifth or beginning of the sixth century. The MS. is of interest as a late specimen in this style of writing; for capitals had by this time been generally superseded by uncial characters as the literary hand in codices. And further, it can be approximately dated, for it contains the name of Vettius Agorius Basilius, who there can be little doubt is the consul of the West of that name, who held office in the year 527. The writing is very regular and free, and, though rather ornamental, has little of the imitative effort which is so evident in that of the Utrecht Psalter. With this plate is given a facsimile of one of the pages of the Latin Christian poem of the year 394, written in uncials of the sixth century and bound up in the same volume as the Prudentius. Next follow seven plates from uncial MSS. ascribed to the sixth century. The Lyons Pentateuch is one of those rarer MSS. which are written in triple columns. The text is ante-Hieronymian. A part of this MS. was sold by Libri to the late Lord Ashburnham; but has been restored to its place by the present Earl. Another MS., which also contributed towards Professor Libri's collection of ancient MSS., is the Psalter (plate 3), also of Lyons, written in uncials on an abnormally large scale, a part of which is now in the library of Ashburnham Place. The *Coder Puternus*, containing the third decade of Livy (plate 4), apart from its value as one of the earliest MSS. of the author, deserves particular attention on account of the character of the uncial hand in which it is written. It is not of the very exactly finished and rounded type which we see in so many of the extant uncial MSS.,

particularly in certain copies of the Gospels, on the execution of which particular pains appear to have been expended, but it is of a free and at first sight more careless type, which at the same time is evidently the work of a most skilful scribe, writing with perfect ease a hand to which he is thoroughly accustomed. This style of writing is still better exemplified in the Vienna MS. of Livy of about the same period. It may be said to bear to uncial writing of the more exact type somewhat the same relation that the freely written rustic capital does to the more formal square capital. The Paris MS. originally belonged to the Abbey of Corbie, from the wreck of whose famous library the Bibliothèque Nationale has gathered so many valuable relics. Although it is here classed among MSS. of the sixth century, it is satisfactory to see a saving clause in the accompanying letter-press by which it may be moved back into the previous century. On the same plate is given a facsimile of the single uncial fragment of the *Natural History* of Pliny in the Bibliothèque Nationale, written in round uncials and certainly not so ancient.

The next five plates represent works by St. Hilary, Origen, and St. Augustine, all taken from MSS. preserved in the library at Lyons, and most of them written in the fine half-uncial hand of the sixth century, certain dated specimens of which form so prominent a feature in the *Exempla* of Zangemeister and Wattenbach. The important part which this character of writing played in the formation of our own English hand through its earlier adoption by the Irish, renders it an object of special interest to English palaeographers. Its influence also in the school of Tours, which evolved from it the ornamental half-uncial hand which the scribes of that school employed with such effect in certain parts of their handsomely written Bibles, has been recently traced by M. Delisle in one of his many valuable contributions to the study of palaeography. The series of early uncial MSS. is brought to a close with a facsimile from the MS. of canons of councils and papal constitutions, once belonging to Corbie and now in the Bibliothèque Nationale.

The interest of the next following plates is historical. Facsimiles of three ancient MSS. of the *Historia Francorum* of Gregory of Tours, viz. those of Beauvais, Corbie, and Cambrai, all ascribed to the seventh century, give us specimens of the later uncial and of cursive, and a curious example of the half-uncial in an ornamental style; and these are

followed by a plate from the earliest extant MS. of the chronicle of Fredegar.

The progress of French writing from the intricate convolutions of the cursive hands to the simple and elegant Caroline minuscule may be followed in the series of facsimiles which illustrate the eighth and ninth centuries. We can only particularly refer to the plate of the Bible of Theodulf of Orleans, of the ninth century, and those of the MSS. of Charles le Chauve and the Emperor Lothair, as giving fine examples of handwriting; and with regard to the later facsimiles in the volume, their interest is so varied that we must be content to single out those which put themselves more prominently forward.

Plate 23 gives us a specimen of the Greek and Latin Glossary of Laon, of the ninth century, one of those curious MSS. in which we see a western scribe struggling with a language and an alphabet almost forgotten. Among the specimens of the twelfth century is a section from the mortuary roll of Vitalis, founder and abbot of Savigny, who died in 1122. The roll, as was the custom, passed from monastery to monastery, asking for the prayers of the brethren and receiving at each house a few lines of formal commendation and the 'orate pro nostris.' The palaeographical interest of such mortuary rolls, some of which extend to many feet in length, lies in the fact that in a brief compass we have specimens of writing of so many different hands of one and the same period, and these not always from the pens of practised scribes, but also in the unpretending style of simple scholars. Another curiosity of the next century is the sketch-book of the architect Villard de Hannecourt, to whom the construction of the cathedral of Cambrai is said to have been entrusted.

Two celebrated historical MSS. are also represented: the autograph MS. of the

Historia Ecclesiastica of Ordericus Vitalis of 1141, and the curiously written copy of the Chronicle of Guillaume de Nangis of the end of the thirteenth century. Three of the plates are connected with Saint Louis. We have a facsimile of his will, dated 'in navi nostra juxta Sardiniam,' when setting out on his second crusade in July, 1270; a page from a beautiful illuminated Psalter, which was executed for him; and a specimen of the earliest MS. of that most simple and charming of chroniclers, the Sire de Joinville. In a MS. of the *Information des Princes* by Jean Goulain, there is presented to us a portrait of Charles the Fifth of France, that great collector of fine MSS., several of which contribute to illustrate the series before us. And lastly we may notice two parallel pages from MSS. of the *Miracles de Notre Dame* written by Jean Miélot for Philip the Good of Burgundy, and finely illustrated by artists of the Burgundian school. One of these MSS. is in the Bodleian Library.

In noticing the later MSS. in this *Album* we may perhaps have tried the patience of those readers of the *Classical Review* whose interest may be principally limited to the more classical MSS. of the uncial period. We hope that in future issues of this work the members of the *École des Chartes* will not forget this interest, and that they will continue to provide in sufficient numbers facsimiles of the Latin classical MSS. preserved in French libraries. Greek MSS. are almost entirely excluded from the present volume. If this exclusion is to be continued in future issues—and the wording of the title-page seems rather to imply it—perhaps it may be found possible to devote a special album to the production of a Greek series of facsimiles from the abundant material which exists at Paris, if not in other parts of France.

E. MAUNDE THOMPSON.

ENGELHARDT ON LATIN CONJUGATION.

Die Lateinische Konjugation nach der Ergebnissen der Sprachvergleichung dargestellt, von MAX ENGELHARDT. Berlin: Weidmann. 1887. Pp. viii. 140. 2 Mk. 40.

THIS little treatise is written by one of the straitest sect of the 'young grammarians.' Its purpose is to show the simplicity and the regularity of the Latin verbal system

when viewed in the light of the two great principles of phonetic law and association of form. Not only does it maintain that the structure of the verb becomes more transparent, when so regarded, but also that much light is thrown upon the syntax as well. Some of the illustrations of the latter are enough to take away the breath of a scholar who has not

followed the more recent developements of comparative philology. That the double use of the perfect is due to the fact that it was formed by one or the other of two methods, the former belonging to the perfect tense, the latter properly to the aorist—this is a proposition which might not startle him. That the personal terminations should be due to a blending of the old perfect with the weak aorist would seem a little more surprising. That the future perfect was a modified form of the conjunctive of the sigmatic aorist would appear almost inconceivable. But bewilderment would reach its height, when it was gravely stated that the conjunctive imperfect was only a form of the aorist indicative in Latin. And yet no one of these statements is strictly novel; there is much to be said for every one of them; and it is certain both that they are phonetically possible, and that some rules of syntax become by their admission much more easy to understand. The treatise of Dr. Engelhardt, like the still more compressed statement of similar views by Dr. Stolz, in Iwan Müller's *Handbuch*, is a work of exposition, not of discussion; and hence it often appears to fall into the besetting sin of philologists, and to say 'is' or 'must be,' where a sober reader is inclined to substitute 'seems to be' or 'may be.' The fact is that we are at a stage where a wise discretion will use a negative form of utterance more frequently than a positive. If we meet with the assertion that 'the best derivation of *provincia* is from *providentia*,' we may modestly but firmly deny this, seeing that it is in direct violation of three well-established laws, the action of any one of which is fatal to it. But if we are asked what the true derivation is, it may be incumbent on us to use some hesitating form of speech. Mr. Roby, fifteen years ago, refused to worship at the fashionable shrine of Corssen, and to construct the vowel system of Latin according to the rules of Sanskrit grammarians; and the result is that not a page of his grammar is antiquated to-day, while works of the same date that seemed to be leading the van can now be used only as warnings, or at best as landmarks of the advance of science.

It is impossible within narrow limits even to state, still less to discuss, the points on which the new philology leads to results different from those given in the current grammars. A few must be selected for comment. Forms like *monordi* are represented as coming from an original

merdo, and as giving rise in their turn to the later present *mordea*: while conversely it is asserted that the perfect of *verto* must have been originally *revorti*. This ingenious view of De Saussure's brings in a parallelism with forms like γέγορα or ἔμμορα, but this is hardly adequate evidence for the conjecture to be put forward as a fact. As a matter of fact, there seems to be quite as much evidence for regarding *vortit* as a present form and *vertit* as the perfect, a doctrine which Professor Key used to lay down with some confidence. For instance, in Plaut. *Amphitr. Prol.*, 95, the MSS. have *animum advortite*, but in l. 121 they have the perfect *vertit*, though Goetz and Loewe change this into *vortit*. Similarly in *Trucul.* 221, the MSS. (including A) have *verterunt*, again changed by Schoell into *vorterunt*. The case is precisely the same in *Trin. Prol.*, 19. In fact, although the form *vort-* is commonly enough given by the MSS. of Plautus in the imperfect tenses, I have noted no instance as yet in which it is given in a perfect form. If this observation is correct, it seems a little bold to assume that our earliest authorities have not only not preserved but have actually inverted the archaic forms.

The startling thesis, due to Stolz, *Verbal-flexion*, that *stare* = ἰσθῆσα, is based upon the form *astasent* given by Festus (p. 26, M.) and there explained by *statuerunt*, the long *e* being derived from the analogy of *audiem*, *audies*, &c., which retain the characteristic of the optative. Phonetically there is nothing against the view, and it finds strong confirmation in the hypothetical use of the tense. It is a curious commentary on the prevalent notion of the force of 'doubt' attaching to the subjunctive mood alone that, as Mr. Roby well points out, Cicero, after using *si* with the indicative, has to alter the form of the expression to show that there is no doubt.

The forms *stas*, *stat*, &c., are explained to be aorist forms, which have lost the augment, and which afterwards created by analogy the first person *sto* in imitation of *-ao* verbs. The future *ero* is asserted to be a conjunctive present (= Gr. ὦ for ἄσ-ω), the vowel after the *e* being the conjunctive vowel which appears as *e* and *o* in the non-thematic Greek conjunctive (e.g. ἐπύσσονται: cf. ἵπτερ by the side of ἵπτε), where there is no vowel appended to the stem, except that required to indicate the mood. With regard to the inflexions of the perfect, Dr. Engelhardt follows the most recent views, which find in the well-known *dede* of the

Pisaurian inscriptions not a mutilated form, but an instance of the true perfect termination, to which *d* is added by 'contamination' with the aorist, (*i.e.* a borrowing of aoristic forms for an allied tense), ultimately becoming *t*. Osthoff's view of the *i* of the first person in the perfect as a termination originally proper to the middle voice is also accepted without question. Similarly, his theory that the *-sti* of the perfect is due to a blending of the *s* of the aorist, and the *-ti* of the perfect, as in forms like *dixiti*, from which *dixisti* came only at a later date, is given without hesitation.

Dr. Engelhardt's work does not, so far as I am aware, make any claim to originality; but it gives in a clear and complete form

the latest results of philological speculation into the origin of Latin verbal flexion. The most serious drawback that I have noticed is that references to Neue's *Formenlehre* are made to the first and much less complete edition. Whether English schoolmasters will think it advisable to introduce these speculations even to their more advanced pupils is a question which it would not be easy to answer with as much confidence as Dr. Engelhardt seems to feel in the case of his German colleagues. But many an English teacher ought to find the book interesting and stimulating, even if it is not practically useful.

A. S. WILKINS.

THE NEW EDITION OF BOECKH'S *PUBLIC ECONOMY OF ATHENS*.

Die Staatshaushaltung der Athener, von AUGUST BOECKH. Dritte Auflage herausgegeben und mit Anmerkungen begleitet von Max Fränkel. 2 vols. Berlin. G. Reimer. 1886. 30 Mk.

IN one of his notes (No. 746) to the volumes before us, Fränkel has called attention to the great value of Boeckh's treatment of the question he is discussing even where it was based on error and accordingly has led to an erroneous conclusion. Boeckh had supposed that the Public Treasure at Athens had consisted of a number of separate parts, *viz.*, that of Athena Polias, that of Athena Nikê, &c., and was accordingly driven to display the greatest ingenuity in explaining how such a vast sum as 7,000 talents, which had been 'brought into the acropolis' (Andoc. *De Pace*, 8; Æschin, *De Fals. Leg.* 175) between 422 and 416 B.C., may have been expended, especially as the actual treasury accounts of those and the succeeding years are so small. Boeckh, however, honestly confesses that he is not satisfied with his own ingenuity and feels that there is something wrong. Since then Kirchhoff (*Zur Geschichte des Ath. Staatsschatzes im 5^{ten} Jahrhundert*, in the *Abhandl. der Berliner Akad.* 1876) has shown that these were special temple treasures quite distinct from the Public Treasure, which was also kept in the Temple of Athena. The Hellenotamiae administered what belonged to the state, the treasurers of Athena what belonged to Athena. An analogy

from later times is given (Note 268) from a Delphic inscription, which shows that the Public Treasure was kept along with the Sacred Treasure in the Temple of Apollo; the latter being administered by *ιεροποιοί*, the former by *ταμίαι*. This may be taken as a signal example of the value of Boeckh's method. The editor of the *Corpus of Greek Inscriptions* had wide learning, but that learning never overwhelmed him. Like Grote, he had that vivid intuition of reality and that transparent simplicity of expression which belong to true genius; like Grote also, he is never in a hurry, but always proceeds cautiously and reviews the whole position according as each point is gained; and above all he is never actuated by any other desire than to attain to the truth, and accordingly, when he does fall into error, always shows quite plainly how his mistake has arisen.

The excellent scholar who has brought out this new edition of Boeckh's great work has shown sound judgment in the course he has adopted. He has not altered a single word of Boeckh's own writing, but has reproduced the second edition, mistakes and all, as the text; under the text are the references, all looked up and compared with the best modern editions, together with additional notes from Boeckh's private papers and books. The editor's supplementary notes to the first volume are printed at the end of the second volume. In the second volume, to which Boeckh had appended no notes, the supplementary notes are added at

the foot of the page. Fränkel's notes all through are most learned and pertinent. He has studied the many books and magazine articles bearing on the several questions with that methodical completeness and patience which characterise German scholars; and he has not forgotten to give our scholars who have worked in the same field, Newton and Hicks, their just meed of recognition. There is an excellent index; the printing is clear and accurate; and the work is enriched with an etching of Boeckh when he was a young man in about 1817, which it is interesting to compare with the portrait of the veteran scholar in his maturer years given by the American translator.

While recognizing as clearly as possible the great merits of Boeckh, Fränkel is far from being a blind disciple. Thus, where Boeckh takes τὰς εἰσφορὰς τὰς ἀπὸ Ναυσινίκου (Dem. *Androt.* 44) as the income-tax of the year of Nausinicus, Fränkel after a review of the many interpretations of the passage, (Note 82) concurs in the opinion that the expression must mean the income-taxes of the twenty-four years between the archonship of Nausinicus and the date of the speech. This is Grote's view (viii. 110, note 3); but then the number τριακόσια is too small. Boeckh (quoted in Note 821) considers rightly that, as Demosthenes paid eighteen minae as income-tax in ten years on a rateable property of three talents, the amount of income-tax derived from the whole rateable property of the country, which was 6000 talents (*De Symmor.* § 19), must have been 600 talents in the same period. Fränkel accordingly thinks that there is a corruption in the word τριακόσια. Mr. Pearson on pp. 77, 78, of this Review has reverted to Boeckh's opinion, urging that there is reference to a property tax of 5 per cent. which Androtion was employed to collect in *Androt.* 617, § 77. But δεκατέοντες there is used quite generally for any excessive taxation and the double income-tax of the second clause does not necessarily refer to δεκατέοντες. And it is hard to assent to the unusual interpretation Mr. Pearson gives of εἰσφορὰς τὰς ἀπὸ Ναυσινίκου and of the plural εἰσφορὰς without examples of such usages being adduced.

It will be possible to mention only a few of the points in which Fränkel has collected material tending to correct and supplement Boeckh. Notable among the scholars who have furthered knowledge in this department are Kirchhoff and Köhler, the editors of the *Corpus of Attic Inscriptions*. Kirch-

hoff has, as we have seen, set Boeckh right as to the Public Treasure. Again, on another point, viz. the obligation of the cleruchi to tribute, Kirchhoff (*Abhandl. der Berliner Akad.* 1873) has shown against Boeckh that they were not subject to any tribute. What appears to be such was really paid by the states in whose territories cleruchi were settled; for there were numbers of cases in which cleruchi were settled *beside* the original inhabitants, the latter not having been completely expelled. As regards the much-discussed ὀρχήστρα in Plat. *Apol.* 26 D¹, Boeckh says that it means the Dionysiac theatre and that books were sold there during the time no performances were being held. Schöne maintains that ὀρχήστρα was the name of a place in Athens where was the book market (τὰ βιβλία) which is referred to by Eupolis and Pollux; it was north of the slope between the Acropolis and the Areopagus (Timaeus *lex. s.v.* ὀρχήστρα, compared with Arrian, *Anab.* iii. 16, 8, quoted in Baumeister, *Denkmäler* i. 164, 165). But Fränkel (Note 89) points out that as papyrus about this time cost nearly three drachmas for two pieces (*C. I. A.* i. 324, col. c, l. 33), it is very improbable that books could be sold at such a low price as a drachma, so that we must acquiesce in the view that ὀρχήστρα means the stage and that the reference is to Euripides as the exponent of the doctrines of Anaxagoras. Fränkel presses his point by urging that thus εἰ πᾶν πολλοῦ gets a strong force, for the fee for the *whole* three days' performance at the Dionysia at two obols a day would be a drachma; and again that Euripides as the disciple of Anaxagoras did call the sun χρυσέαν βῶλον in the *Phaethon* (Diog. L. ii. 10). He might have added *Orestes*, 982 ff. and the Scholiast. But did the Athenian stage never act anything except Euripides at the time of the trial of Socrates? And would Socrates approve of people taking their philosophical opinions second-hand, and second-hand from the rhetorical stage (cf. *Gorg.* 502 B)? Further too it is more probable that the χάρται alluded to in the inscription were sheets of some special kind adapted for book-keeping; for we find in the second century that similar sheets for book-keeping cost five drachmas (*Bull. de corr. hell.* vi. 23), yet we know that ordinary χαρτία to write notes on in the third century cost only a trifle. It is related of Cleanthes that he was so very poor that he had not even the κέρματα necessary to buy χαρτία, and had to

¹ On this compare Adam *in loc.* who argues against Fränkel.

commit the notes of Zeno's lectures to potsherds and the shoulder-blades of oxen (Diog. L. vii. 174). The name Euripides reminds us of the financial proposal of another Euripides alluded to in Aristoph. *Ecl.* 818 ff. which Boeckh has strangely considered to be a direct property-tax, a view which Fränkel (Note 803) criticises with considerable vigour and shows after Grote (vii. 544) that Boeckh is somewhat heedless in this discussion. We can feel sure of nothing about the proposal except that the 500 talents were 'comic exaggeration.' Another point in which Boeckh is criticised is his view that the plaintiff had not to pay the *ἐπωβελία* if he got one-fifth of the votes. This is disproved by Libanius ap. R. Förster in *Hermes* ix. p. 53, καὶ οἱ παρ' ἡμῶν νόμοι μετὰ τὰς ἀφέσεις τῶν ἡγωνισμένων οὐκ αὐτοῖς τιμὴν ἐμμετροῦσι ἀλλ' ἐπιτίμια τοῖς οὐχ ἐλοῦσι ἐπωβελίαν καὶ πρυτανεῖα κἂν μηδὲ λάβῃ τὸ πέμπτον μέρος τῶν ψήφων ἡτίμωται, by the silence of most grammarians, and by such passages as Dem. *Aphob.* i. § 67, Isocr. *adv. Call.* § 3. Apparent exceptions such as Isocr. *l. c.* § 12. Poll. viii. 48, are to be referred to special kinds of process, in the former case to διαμαρτυρία, in the latter to φάσις, if indeed the latter is not, as Förster thinks (p. 71), a confusion made by Pollux between the *ἐπωβελία* and the 1,000 drachmas, which had to be paid in all γραφαὶ except εἰσαγγελίαι, in case the prosecutor did not get one-fifth of the votes (cf. Dem. *Theocr.* § 6). Fränkel holds that the plaintiff if defeated in any case paid the *ἐπωβελία*, the defendant had to pay it only in case he made a counter-plea or exception, and even then he remained free if he got one-fifth of the votes. It is to be noticed that Fränkel is not afraid to confess that he was in error (in his *Geschwornengerichte*) in assenting to Philochorus (in Schol. on Aristoph. *Vesp.* 718) and Boeckh, that in 446 there were only 19,000 nominal Attic citizens, of whom 4,760 were disqualified. In 432 there were at all events 27,000 (Thuc. ii. 13), which is too large an increase for fourteen years. Rather the 19,000 of Philochorus were only those citizens who gave in their names for the distribution of corn. But all trivial and unintelligent criticism of his master (such as Beloch's contention that the meaning of *τίμημα* is 'property' not 'rateable property')

Fränkel brushes aside with that vigorous and trenchant stroke of which he has given us a good example in his contention with Thalheim in the matter of the *Antidosis*.

Supplementary matter occupies the most extensive portion of Fränkel's notes. Thus reference is made to *C. I. A.* ii. 834b (in the Addenda) to show more fully the prices of building materials; to the list of proscribed goods sold by the *πωληταί* (*C. I. A.* i. 274, l. 15) to show that houses cost as little as 105 drachmas; while again we find in the lease of a house and land by the phratría of the Dyaleis to Diodorus (*C. I. A.* ii. 600) that rent, though usually about 8 p.c., was in this case 12 p.c. of the value, and that the lessee was to put the house in order and fulfil other duties so as to keep the land in proper condition. Further reference is made to the lists of the *πωληταί* (i. 277, l. 16) for additional information on the price of slaves, and to the Delphic inscriptions published by Wescher and Foucart on the prices paid for their manumission, with some valuable remarks (Note 120) on the standard of money (which was not the Attic) referred to in these documents. That there was sometimes a public administration of charitable donations for education is shown (Note 211) by important inscriptions of Teos and Delphi (see *Bull. de corresp. hell.* iv. 111, v. 157), especially the former (cf. *Hermes* ix. 501–503) where there is much detail as to the annual salaries of the teachers who were elected yearly; the music-master was most highly paid, 700 drachmas. It is noticeable that girls had a share in the education (l. 9). Often too, Fränkel gives good summaries of the results of recent discussion, e.g. in regard to the charges against Phidias (Note 350), and concerning the Athenian *γραμματεῖς* (Note 340), though in this latter place he has not mentioned the dissertation of Kornitzer.

At the end of his preface, Fränkel has expressed a hope that this new edition, which has gone forth a century after Boeckh's birth, may continue to advance our knowledge and to increase the fame of its author. In joining in this hope may we be allowed to say that its realization will be in no small degree due to the learning, patience, and judgment of the able editor.

SHORTER NOTICES.

Poetae Lyrici Graeci Minores. Edidit JOH. POMTOW.
2 voll. Leipzig. Hirzel, 1885. (Price 5 Mk.)

THE want of a handy edition of the text of the Greek lyric poets has long been felt, and these small volumes supply it very satisfactorily. There is no preface, and it is not stated what text is followed; but where I have made any detailed comparison, it seems to keep pretty close to that of Bergk. Each volume has an excellent double index.

When we ask what should be included in a volume of this title, we are at once met by the difficulty that there is no satisfactory definition of lyrical poetry. The term did not come into use till a late period, and even then was used vaguely. The modern theory which defines a lyric as a poem expressing some single emotion, and so distinct on the one side from narrative and on the other from reflective poetry, is quite foreign to ancient criticism, and cannot well be applied to ancient poetry. What the name practically means to us in Greek literature is (1) the song, including the lyrical portions of tragedy and comedy, and such forms as the *scolion*, the *hymnæus*, or the *citharistia*; and (2) poems written in certain defined metres which as a matter of fact are suitable (*ὑπὸ πείρας ἡρμοκεν*) to the expression of emotional poetry.

So long as we confine ourselves to these melic poems, the task of selection is pretty plain; though the definition, wide as it is, would not cover the two noble hexameters of Eumelus with which this collection most fittingly opens, nor the famous *Ἀλακάτα* of Erinna. But when we admit poems written in the elegiac and iambic metres as lyrical, difficulties appear at once. There is no difference of kind between these iambic pieces and many fragments of speeches from lost dramas: yet it is precisely the speeches in dramas that we call distinctively the non-lyrical portions. Again, it would seem strange to exclude Theognis from the lyric list. But no one calls Propertius a lyric poet. And if we admit Theognis, how are we to exclude the epigrammatists? Herr Pomtow has here thrown theory overboard altogether, and admits any fragment of poetry otherwise unclassified of a date anterior to 300 B.C. Sometimes the results are curious. When Bergk prints the epigrams attributed to Sappho or Simonides, it is sufficient justification that these were essentially lyrical poets, and that it is therefore proper to include everything they wrote, or were supposed to have written. But when Herr Pomtow prints sepulchral and votive inscriptions from *Kaibel* or the *Corpus Inscriptionum*, the case is different. For instance

Σιμίαν μ' ἀνέθηκε Ποτειδάφωι Φάνακτι,
vol. i. p. 334,

or Θουκυδίδης Ὀλόρου Ἀλιμούσιος,
vol. ii. p. 144,

cannot by any reach of imagination be called lyrical poems, if indeed they can be called poems at all.

It is perhaps more interesting to observe what he has done in selection and rejection of the fragments of the better-known poets. This task must always be a delicate one, and individual judgments will vary much as to the limit of length or of intelligibility which makes a fragment worth printing in what does not profess to be a complete collection. The present editor has on the whole shown sound judgment in his choice. To take, as a crucial instance, the fragments of Sappho: out of the 117 fragments (excluding the epigrams and what follows them) in Bergk, Herr Pomtow prints sixty-six. It may be safely said that no one of these sixty-six would be better away; and most of the remaining fifty-one have no distinct

literary value. On the other hand there are at least five of these last (18, 30, 37, 38, 88 in Bergk) which are as characteristic and as beautiful as anything in Sappho: it is not obvious why

πολλά μοι τὰν

Πωλυανάκτιδα παῖδα χαίρην

should be admitted to the exclusion of

ὥς δὲ παῖς πέδα μάτέρα πεπτερύγωμαι

and

τί με Πανδίωνις ὦ ῥαῖνα χελιδών;

And it may be fairly urged that the least relic of the really great poets is more worth preserving than any amount of verse of the Θουκυδίδης Ὀλόρου Ἀλιμούσιος order: though against that there is a superficial argument for representative selection of good and bad.

The poems, melic, iambic, elegiac, and miscellaneous, are very sensibly arranged all together in chronological order of authorship, century by century, with the *ἀδέσποτα* inserted as near their chronological place as possible. The book is printed in a small pocket size, on good paper, and with what has been good type. It happens annoyingly often that a letter is missing and the outside edge of a line. A collection on a similar method (but omitting the epigrams) with a translation and no notes, would do much to familiarise English readers with these poor relics of poets whose loss, with the doubtful exception of Menander, is perhaps the greatest that time has inflicted on European literature.

J. W. MACKAIL.

The Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle: Books I-IV (omitting 1-6) and X. 6-9. Translated by Sr. GEORGE STOCK. Oxford: Blackwell. London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co.

THIS is a translation of those parts of the *Ethics* which are taken in for examination by the Oxford passman. To each book is prefixed a brief summary of its contents, and at the end of the whole is placed a series of very minute questions, covering not only every chapter but every section, and designed to bring out every point in Aristotle's argument, sometimes even to suggest reflexion upon it. This 'catechetical analysis' is intended especially to help those who are trying to get up their work by themselves, and it seems very well calculated to do so. Of the translation, which Mr. Stock acknowledges to be meant for 'the less ambitious student,' I should say that it is literal enough for the least ambitious and that, so far as I have tested it, it seems accurate.

H. RICHARDS.

Plutarchi Sulla: with introduction and notes by the Rev. H. A. HOLDEN, LL.D. Cambridge, University Press. 6s.

DR. HOLDEN'S editions of Plutarch's lives of Themistocles and the Græchi have established his reputation as a scholar in the Greek of the later prose writers. In this respect he is seen to full advantage in the present volume. Though the immense learning of Wyttenbach, and the labours of Sintenis and others have greatly lightened the task of editing Plutarch for ordinary readers, Dr. Holden deserves the thanks of all lovers of his author for the completeness of his work, which includes copious verbal and grammatical indices, a brief appendix on the text (to the correction of which the editor has made a single happy contribution, in ch. 28.1), and abundant notes, with parallel passages quoted in full, on all words and constructions the least likely to cause difficulty or arrest the reader's attention.

Considering that the real value of his commentary lies in the linguistic and grammatical portions of it,

it seems a pity that Dr. Holden should not have taken in hand the life of Marius at the same time, or even that of Sertorius as well, and have concentrated his energy and scholarship on the text. As it is, he has buried Plutarch under a vast heap of compilation, much of which consists merely of excerpts from Mommsen and Long, and lengthy quotations or analyses of Appian and other authorities. To fill up Plutarch's gaps is surely not the function of the commentator: nor is it advisable in the interest of education to save the student the trouble of going to the most obvious sources of information. We may take the notes on ch. 27 as an example of this fault. They start with an analysis nearly as long as the chapter itself; to this succeeds another long analysis of two chapters of Appian, also as long as the Greek; and after elaborate notes on various places and individuals, e.g. Dyrrachium, Tifata, Norbanus, &c., we find to our astonishment no less than three pages and a half extracted from Prof. Middleton's *Rome* (a book surely by this time in every library), compressed by a wonderful feat of printing into less than one page of very small print. In the case of this last-mentioned loan Dr. Holden has inadvertently omitted to state that his note is a word-for-word quotation, though at the end of it he has told the reader to refer to Prof. Middleton for additional information on one point. He has taken over from the original at least one misquotation (Liv. 4. 51, for Liv. 7. 3?), and the single addition which he has made (a citation of this life of Sulla 37.3), is likely to puzzle the student, for he is really referring, not to the text of Plutarch, which adds nothing to our knowledge of Sulla's views about the Capitoline temple, but to his own note upon it, which contains the necessary passage from Valerius Maximus. The same tendency to voluminous compilation is also seen in the Introduction, which amongst seventy-three pages of other matter contains the whole of the famous speech of Lepidus in the fragments of Sallust, with an elaborate commentary, based chiefly on Kritz. We almost wonder that Dr. Holden did not revise the text of the fragments of *Licinianus*, and print them as an appendix; for this author, as we read on p. 130, is 'the nearest writer in time to the period of Sulla,' though on p. lxx. of the Introduction, we are told that he probably belongs to the second century of the imperial epoch.

These examples will serve to show that the volume might have been reduced to half its size, without detracting from its value. What is really wanted in England, in the interest both of learning and education, is a good edition of *all* the Lives; i.e. a revised text, with such apparatus for studying the Greek as may be advisable in the way of indices and notes. No one is better qualified to undertake such a work than Dr. Holden. Is it too much to hope that he may take such an enterprise in hand, and thus confer a real benefit on scholars, and indeed on all readers of these cherished biographies, instead of bestowing infinite pains and labour upon work great part of which is unnecessary, and could be done equally well by very inferior scholars.

W. W. FOWLER.

P. Vergili Maronis Georgicon Libri III. IV. Edited with English Notes by A. SIDGWICK, M.A. (Cambridge University Press). 1886. 2s.

THIS is professedly a school edition, 'prepared for the use of those students who are not far advanced in Latin,' but it is one from which others than beginners may learn a good deal. It consists of an Introduction, Text, Notes, and three short Indices, (1) Grammatical and General, (2) Style, (3) Names.

As regards the text, the following readings deserve

mention:—*incohat* in III. 42, *expertans* in III. 402, *alvaria* in IV. 34, all surely right. In IV. 291–3, Mr. Sidgwick adopts the order of Rom., instead of following Med. with Conington. In III. 449, it is scarcely accurate to say 'there is good MSS. authority' for *vivaque sulfura*: the authority, according to Conington, is one of Ribbeck's cursives together with the testimony of Servius, Marius, Victorinus, and Macrobius, which latter is justly allowed to outweigh MSS. evidence.

The notes are almost too good for the average schoolboy: but will bear abundant fruit in the hands of a boy of naturally scholarly tastes. Mr. Sidgwick always knows his mind, and lets his reader know it; generally, too, in as few words as possible. Often by a happy phrase in translation, he shows us just how much the poet really meant: this is especially valuable where an image is suggested in a word or two, without being worked out into definiteness even in the poet's own mind. An instance occurs in III. 9, where a comparison of Conington's note with Mr. Sidgwick's will show how many words darken counsel: 'float upon the lips of men' will strike all readers as the one obviously right interpretation. In l. 24, *versis discedat frontibus* seems most simply taken, not, with Servius, of two kinds of scenes, but as describing the movements of rotatory prisms meeting in the centre of the back of the stage. In ll. 26–33, Mr. Sidgwick is no doubt right in holding that the lines were written in B.C. 31, and in taking *pulsum* as meaning simply 'defeated.' The note of l. 59 is a useful guide against a Coningtonian pitfall. On l. 307, we would point out that neither of the Greek instances cited are strictly parallel, because in both the accusative appears in the active construction also. Really it is a use of 'internal' accusative surviving as a legitimate variation with the passive verb where it has been superseded by another case with the active. The note on III. 385 receives correction in that on IV. 222, where the rule is given that *-que* is lengthened 'only before liquids and double consonants'. That on IV. 50 shows how careful translation may make an inaccuracy fade into a merely poetical presentation. In IV. 74, Mr. Sidgwick is obviously right in taking the line to mean 'whet their stings on their beaks,' and on l. 165, in taking *sorti* as old ablative. On l. 227, he quotes from Mr. Rhoades a piece of translation liable to be misunderstood: if allowed to do so, the British boy will translate '*sideris in numerum*' 'into the number of the stars,' and we do not think Mr. Rhoades's rendering will prove a sufficient barrier. On l. 317, Mr. Sidgwick exposes the double hypothesis whereon rests the usual account of the source from which Vergil took the story of Aristaeus. In l. 447, Mr. Sidgwick takes the simplest view, making *quicquam* the subject to *fallere*: it seems more probable that the line means 'nor is it possible to deceive thee in aught.' In l. 455, he adopts Servius's view, which is almost certainly the correct one, and he writes an admirable note on l. 457, showing it to be a condensation for 'while she was flying in hope to escape.' Another admirable note is on l. 484, though Mr. Sidgwick does not notice that this usage seems only possible by some sort of semi-personification of a natural power.

The Indices are very good, especially that on Style, which might be made most helpful in teaching composition.

Ὅτις τερον πρότερον Ὀμηρικῶς we come to the Introduction, which, as is often the case with Introductions, should be read after the book. As a whole it is most helpful, though, as we have hinted, somewhat beyond the average boy. It is doubtful too whether

so careful an analysis of the imitations and adaptations of Vergil is not almost pernicious to such a reader. Admiration in a boy is the inevitable first step towards appreciation, and we fear this might be checked if he had reason to suppose that the poet was habitually guilty of 'adaptation.' Something of the same sort may be said about other parts of this Introduction: section 8 is wonderfully good, but it is scarcely in place in an elementary edition. Mr. Sidgwick should devote himself to an Introduction to Vergil on a more ambitious scale: giving himself space to quote parallel passages in full: repeating and amplifying what he has said about Vergilian art in various ways; exhibiting to us Vergil as an artist: allowing himself, by quotations from modern poets, and by full use of his felicity of translation, to show that hendiadys and the rest are not conundrums to vex the ignorant, but real aids to poetical expression.

F. C.

Tacitus, par ÉMILE PERSON. Paris: Eugene Belin. (Annals 1883. Histories 1880).

THESE two volumes are evidently intended either for the higher classes of schools or for such general students as desire complete editions of moderate size and at moderate cost.

Such publications can only be made remunerative by a very large sale; and it is good evidence of the general interest taken by educated Frenchmen in great classical authors that editors or publishers should feel any such prospect of success as is implied in undertaking a work of this description, instead of restricting themselves, as is usual in England, to an edition comprising one or two books only.

The volumes are a marvel of cheapness. For 3 f. 50 c., the French student can procure a well-printed book of 786 foolscap octavo pages, containing the whole of the Annals, with a concise, but by no means meagre commentary and introduction, the speech of Claudius, and an index of proper names. The other volume gives, for 2 f., in 460 pages, the whole of the Histories on a similar scale, with the additional gain of a summary of the contents of the text.

Taken as a whole, this must be pronounced to be, as far as I am aware, much the most useful general edition of this author to be found in any language, at anything like so low a cost. Nor is it to be supposed that its cheapness is its only recommendation. Viewed apart from such considerations, the commentary is eminently clear and practical, ignoring none of the chief difficulties of interpretation in the text, and giving as much assistance in illustration of the subject-matter as any readers to whom Tacitus was part of a general course of study rather than a special subject would be likely to desire.

On comparison with more elaborate editions or with school editions containing only a small portion of the author, it will be found that the chief curtailment consists in dwelling less fully on grammatical questions, and in giving the general substance of, rather than full references to or citations from, ancient authors and modern works.

The edition of the Annals seems rather superior to that of the Histories, partly, perhaps, as being the later work and hence the result of a more complete study of the author, partly as having had the full advantage of the labours of Nipperdey, Draeger, and E. Jacob; whereas the edition of the Histories appeared too soon to be able to profit by any portion of that of Meiser.

It appears from the advertisement that the same firm has published the Germania at 75 c., the Agricola at 30 c., the former by the same editor, the latter by M. H. Henry.—H. FURNEAUX.

The Histories of Tacitus, Books I. and II., by A. D. GODLEY, M.A., Fellow of Magdalen Coll. Oxford (Macmillan & Co.) 5s.

THIS is a useful little edition, deriving its chief value from the closeness with which the notes of Dr. Carl Heraeus have been followed. This indebtedness is acknowledged in the preface, and those who do not read German ought to be grateful to Mr. Godley for bringing 'this excellent commentary' within their reach. In one passage, however, the editor has followed his guide not wisely but too well. On II. 16, 4. he remarks that Sardinia and Corsica, though handed over by Nero to the senate, were governed by a procurator as being a small province. As a senatorial province it could of course only be governed by a proconsul. The mistake is evidently caused by Heraeus' note on II. 12, 13, where he says that the Maritime Alps 'als eine kleine senats-provinz,' was ruled by a procurator. Is 'senats-provinz' a slip on the part of Heraeus or a misprint? Mr. Godley is not strictly correct in saying on I. 2, 5, that the siege of Jerusalem was contemporary with the war between the Flavians and Vitellius. Again on I. 39, 7, the Rostra Julia are stated to be near the temple of Saturn, and erected by J. Caesar. Prof. Middleton p. 157, referred to in proof of this, shows that they were built by Augustus, being in fact the podium of the Heroon of Julius. The note on *evocatum* I. 41, 16, is incorrect, as the special meaning of the word under the empire is left unnoticed. One or two other little inaccuracies need correcting in a 2nd edition, e.g. the statements on I. 50, 14, that Perusia was the scene of a battle, or on I. 52, 16, that Cæcina commanded in Upper, Valens in Lower Germany. A comparison of *non arma noscere* (I. 63, 5), with *non principia noscere* (II. 93) seems to suggest a better translation than 'they were ignorant of the use of arms'; and the note on *adjuncto Brit. exercitu* I. 61, ignores the fact that only *vexilla* of the British legions joined Vitellius. The different readings are usually given with care, and emendations judiciously selected, but it is aggravating to find so many vague references to Juvenal, Horace, Pliny, &c.—E. G. H.

Thirteen Satires of Juvenal. Edited by C. H. PEARSON, M.A., and H. A. STRONG, M.A., LL.D. Clarendon Press, Oxford: 1887. 6s. 6d.

WE have here in two handy volumes the text of the satires contained in Professor Mayor's edition together with sixty pages of introduction and a whole volume of commentary. It is to be regretted that the editors have entirely excluded the sixth satire, which has been declared by a most competent judge to be Juvenal's masterpiece and which, unlike the other two unrepresented satires, can be freely expurgated without material injury to the sense and connection of the whole. Mr. Prior's school edition, which the editors do not mention, though it was at least until lately the most commonly used in English schools, contrives to retain nearly 600 lines of this satire, while rejecting all that an edition of the kind ought to be without.

The introduction, by Mr. Pearson, is a well-written and interesting piece of literary criticism. A special feature in it and indeed in the whole book is the amount of illustration from French literature—illustration which is often ingenious and interesting. Some will perhaps dissent from the conclusion that Juvenal was the one true poet of his day. According to our current ideas and definitions it is difficult to justify the claim of any writer of the Flavian age to that title; and, if we are to make comparisons, it

can hardly be maintained that in point of style and purity of language Juvenal ranks as high as Martial. One thing is certain however that Juvenal has always had plenty of admirers, so much so that with Tacitus he has come to represent to the general reader the literature of his age. On the literary connection of Juvenal with Martial there is a separate essay in which the views of Professor Nettleship are given. The essay does not seem to prove much in face of the fact that Martial, while constantly speaking of the literary achievements of his friends, never mentions the satires of Juvenal. For his silence concerning Statius, which might seem to be a parallel case, there were special reasons, as Friedlaender has proved almost to demonstration. There are also two essays on 'the social conditions of the early empire' and on the Roman *satura*.

The text adopted is that of Otto Jahn, corrected by R. Beer's fresh collation of the great Montpellier manuscript, commonly called the Pithoeanus. Unfortunately it appears that the first volume was printed too soon to admit any of the remarkable variants of Buecheler's new recension of Jahn. Readers of the *Classical Review* have already seen how numerous and important these are. It is to be hoped that no edition after this will offer in sat. viii. 148 *multo sufflamine consul*; and this is only one of many corruptions which Buecheler's edition should finally dispose of. The editors do not seem to suggest any emendations of their own.

The commentary seems to show wide reading and contains a quantity of information of different kinds; but it appears to us the least satisfactory part of the work. Any one proposing to write a commentary on Juvenal is in a peculiar position, because all that can be done for the explanation and illustration of the subject-matter has already been done by Professor Mayor in his great edition. His best plan would be to start with the fullest acknowledgements to that treasure of learning and then to skim it judiciously, rejecting what is useless or excessive for younger students; but he would be able perhaps to add something of his own, chiefly in the way of critical and grammatical notes; for Professor Mayor more commonly gives the sources of grammatical information than the rules themselves. Another more ambitious plan would be possible though perhaps less prudent—to abstain from consulting Professor Mayor at all. The present editors have followed neither of these plans. They are very largely indebted to their predecessor; of this any one can satisfy himself by a comparison of the two commentaries on the first hundred lines; any number of quotations, some from sources like Ammianus Marcellinus and Seneca's tragedies, appear in both without any indication that they have been transferred from the earlier to the later. The editors in their preface pay some vague compliments to the learned Professor; do they think that that formality absolves them from the duty of acknowledging the extent of their obligation? The occasional references in the notes are quite inadequate.

When that part of the commentary, which appears also in Professor Mayor's edition, is subtracted, the remainder is for the most part such that one could very well dispense with it. Take for example the following notes:—

Sat. i. 3. *togatas*. These were opposed to *palliatæ*, in which the scene was laid at Athens. Most of the Roman plays were of this nature.

25. *gravis mihi barba sonabat*, 'my beard sounded so grandly.'

26. *pars Niliacæ plebis*, 'this spawn of the canaille of the Delta.'

64. Catullus was able to save enough in Bithynia, he tells us (x. 20), *octo homines parare rectos Ad lecticam*.

iii. 78. *miseris*, jussive or concessive use.

85. *baca nutrita Sabina*, 'reared on Sabine fare.'

iv. 16. 'To be sure, he gave a sesterce for every pound.'

154. L. Aelius Lamia was put to death by Domitian. Horace addresses two odes to him.

vii. 26. *pertunde (libellos)*, 'get them devoured.'

viii. 118. *qui saturant urbem*, 'who throng the capital.'

x. 82. *magna est fornacula*, 'many another statue will go into the furnace.'

xii. 5. *extensum petulans quatit hostia funem*. The animal goes quietly, for the rope is trailing at length.

We quote these notes to show the faults by which the original part of the commentary is disfigured. There are wrong translations and inaccurate translations; there are general statements which, to be true, require serious modification; there are grave errors in syntax and chronology. The spelling of Latin words is often wrong: we find such solecisms as *coena*, *annulus*, *milliaria*. There are also faults of mere carelessness: occasionally the notes deal with a different reading from the text (e.g. viii. 90), or with lines which do not appear in the text at all (e.g. x. 306, 313; xi. 162).

There is still room for a school edition of Juvenal, as Professor Mayor's wonderful book is obviously unsuitable for young boys, and he has not yet completed his excellent abridgement of himself. We hope he will yet do so; the ground has certainly not been occupied by this latest edition.

J. D. DUFF.

M. Fubi Quintiliani institutionis oratoriae libri duodecim. Edidit FERDINANDUS MEISTER. Vol. i. lib. i-vi. Cr. 8vo. pp. xii, 289. 1 M. 20 Pf. Vol. ii. lib. vii-xii. pp. iv, 363. 1 M. 50 Pf. Lips. G. Freytag. Præge, F. Tempsky. 1886-7.

FORMS a part of the 'Bibliotheca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum edita curante Carolo Schenkl,' which, though as yet little known in England, deserves encouragement not less than the earlier series of Teubner, Tauchnitz, Weidmann.

The publishers boast, and as regards their part always, as regards their editors' nearly always, with justice, that their editions are distinguished by a text brought up to the level of latest research; by a critical preface and a concise apparatus at the foot of the page; by a handsome, bold type, and good paper; and by a very moderate price.

As yet there have appeared Eurip. Med. Hipp. (Barthold), Herodotus (Holder, not quite complete), Hesiod and Hom. Il. (by Rzach), Hom. Od. (Cauer), hymni epigr. Batrachom. (Abel), Orphica with Proeli hymni, hymni magici, etc. (Abel), Plato, apol., Crito, Protag. (J. Král, Phædo in preparation), Soph. (Schubert). Announced: Demosth. orat. sel. (H. Schenkl or C. Wotke), Lysias (Gerth), Plut. vitæ (C. Th. Michaelis), Thucydides (Cwilinski), Xen. (O. Keller).

Of Latin authors Caes. b. g. (Prammer; b. c. by W. Paul announced), Cic. orat. sel. (Nohl), or. and Brutus (Stangl, who also promises de or.), Cic. philosophical works (Schiche; Lael., Cato, off. are on sale), Corn. Nep. (two edd. one by Andresen, one by A. Weidner), Curtius (abridged, by M. C. P. Schmidt), Eutrop. and Festi breviarium (Wagener), Hor. (Keller and Häussner; the odes also by Petschenig), Livy (Zingerle, the second decade on sale), Ov. (met. by Zingerle; fasti, tr., Ibis, Pont., hal., fragm. by O.

Güthling; the remaining poems by Sedlmayer have not yet appeared), Sall. (Catil., Jug. orat. epist. cet. by Scheindler), Tac. (J. Müller), Verg. (Klouček). Announced: Sen. rh. (H. J. Müller), Tibullus (Zingerle).

In connexion with the texts illustrated school dictionaries have appeared by K. Jahr to Andresen's, by Weidner to his own, Nepos; by Jurenka to Sedlmayer's selections from Ovid; by Pramner to his Caes. b. g.; by Schmidt to his Curtius; by Ed. Wolff to Tac. Germ.

Meister's book is the more welcome because the only cheap rival (Bonnell's) dates from 1854. He has long been known as a student of Quintilian, inasmuch that Bonnell left to him by will a collation of cod. Bamberg. M 4 14 (saec. x); and he has received important aid from Becher, Kiderlin, Wölflin and Karl Schenkl. He naturally follows in the main Halm's constitution of the text. He has examined nearly all the editions of his author, and endeavours to assign each emendation to its proper owner. In the *addenda* he has registered a conjecture of Nettleship's, which appeared only last year in the *Journal of Philology*. The index of names and things (pp. 298-338) and that of authors cited will be found very useful. The tenth book is also issued separately, price 25 Pf.—JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

Herodoti Historiae, Recensuit ALFRED HOLDER, vol. I. [Lib. I.-IV.] Lipsiae sumptus fecit G. FREYTAG, mdcccxxxvi. 2 Mk.

THIS moiety of the Muses of Herodotus forms a volume of the *Bibliotheca scriptorum Gr. et Rom. ed. curante Carolo Schenkl*. The book is convenient in shape, well printed on fair paper, and pleasant to read. Its price is extremely moderate (two marks). Every student of Herodotus will be glad to possess a copy of this admirable recension, even if already familiar with the editions of Stein and Kallenbergs-Dietsch, and will look forward to its speedy completion with interest. In no other edition will be found so fully and conveniently recorded the latest results of textual criticism in regard to Herodotus. The apparatus submitted to each page includes the conjectural emendations for which *Mnemosyne* and other periodicals must be searched at length. Here may be seen what Cobet, van Herwerden, Madvig, Gompertz and others, over and above the elder and later editors, have done for the destruction and reconstruction of the text. A large number of emendations are received into the editor's text. Probably in this respect the edition is an advance upon its predecessors. The result is an eminently rational and flowing text, as near, perhaps, in essentials as we are likely to get to the lost *codex archetypus*. The MSS. variations are also more fully exhibited than in Stein's smaller edition, and that by an ingenious system of references, wherein $\alpha = A + B$, $\beta = R + V'$, $V' = V + S$. This method keeps the two main textual sources into which the archetype descended vividly before the reader. *Exempli gratia*, I. 1 *κατὰ τῶν τὸ δὲ καὶ Ἑλλήνες κ.τ.λ.* $\alpha\beta$ read δ *καὶ*. Not infrequently α omits, β inserts, or *vice versa*. Examples *passim*. A striking case II. 102, 8 α reads *τῶν*, β omits. Valckenauer reads *ἀστῶν*, Schweighäuser *Αἰγυπτίων*, Gaisford *αὐτῶν*, Stein *τῶν* (*ἄρχε*). This last is Herodotean, cp. III. 1 *et al.* but hardly appropriate *in loco*. Holder omits with β . The principal collation made by the editor for the present edition is the collation of V (Vindobonensis lxxxv. lent to him at Karlsruhe: shades of Bodley, take note!). Stein remains in this respect our greatest benefactor. The last collation of S (Sancroft's MS. at Emman. Coll. Camb.) is still Gaisford's.

Some points of interest may be noted, out of many, suggested by this edition.

In II. 51, 12 Holder brackets *Σαμοθρήκες*. There is MS. authority for its omission, which does not appear. In I. 72, 11, II. 34, 6, IV. 153, 5. Prof. Mahaffy's happy emendations of the numerals are accepted. In the first case, somewhat inconsistently, the literal notation (*ιέ*) is printed in the text. In I. 51, 14 Kirchhoff's *Λακεδαιμονίων φασὶν ὧν* after *Λακεδαιμονίων* is not noticed. In I. 170, 14 our last editor does not help us (cf. Blakesley *in loco*). In II. 40, which presents a veritable hornet's nest to the textual critic, Holder's text admits substantially Stein's conjecture for filling a lacuna which Stein was the first to indicate. In I. 28-29, 1. can the text be considered satisfactory as left by Holder following Stein? In I. 43, 3 Holder lets *τὸ ὄρος* stand. In IV. 79, 6 and 81, 6 it is remarkable that *καὶ—εἶχον* should stand unchallenged; and so perhaps also IV. 124, 1, cp. with 126, 7 *παυσάμενος τοῦ δρόμου*, and with *παυσάμενος τῆς πλάνης* in line 5. In III. 9, 13 α gives *σώζωσι β* gives *ποτίζωσι*. Stein does not think the variation worth noticing and reads *σώζωσι*. Holder reads *σώζωσι*. Similarly in III. 14, 42, where C apparently has *σώζειν*. In regard to the method of reference, the lines of this text are numbered not according to the page, but according to the chapter. It may be regretted by those who use classical texts mainly for material or historical purposes that the paragraphs in the chapters are not numbered, as in the Oxford text; a method which greatly facilitates references for such purposes.

It is right to notice that the number of misprints in this volume is considerable. About forty may be added to the list of *Corrigenda operarum menda* at the end. Some of these are trifling, the omission of a breathing, or accent, or of an obvious letter; others are more serious, though not likely to create a difficulty for any intelligent reader. Still they are disfiguring to a text in all other respects so truly admirable. e.g. Bk. I. c 8, line 7 for *χρόνου* read *χρόνου*, c 41, 6 for *χρηστοῖσι* read *χρηστοῖσι*, 96, 12 for *ταῦτα* read *ταῦτα*, 108, 14 *dele* comma after *ἄλλους* and in 117, 16 after *τάδε*, 143, 15 for *τῇ* read *μῇ*, 149, 7 for *ἀμείρω* read *ἀμείνω*, 161, 2 for *ἀτέσπτεύετο* read *ἐστρατεύετο*, 196, 24 for *χρυσίου* read *χρυσίον*. Bk. II, 44, 12 for *ἀκικόμην* read *ἀπικόμην*, 47, 7 for *ῥ* read *ῥς*, 53 lines 2 and 3 *ad. fin.* the punctuation has been exchanged. 155, 2 for *νοῦ* read *τοῦ* 161, 11 for *ὕπ'* read *ἀπ'*, 170, 2 for *τ'* read *τδ*. Bk. III. 19, 12 *ναυ* should be *ναν*- and next line *Πέρσῃσι* should be *Πέρσῃσι*, 29, 10 *dele* full stop after *τοῦτον*, 62, 11 *ο* should be *δ*. Bk. IV, 62, 10 for *νοῦ* read *τοῦ*, 68, 9, 10 (*οἱ μάντιες*) is superfluous, 128, 6 *dele* *δὲ*, 134, 19 for *γῆν* read *τῆν*, 141, 3 for comma after *Μιλήσιον* put a full stop. Next line for *παῦτα* read *ταῦτα*, 154, 6 and 7 one *εἶναι* is superfluous, 159, 5 for colon substitute comma after *καλεσμένου*. As in many of the best Greek texts printed in Germany, the type seems worn, or imperfectly inked at places. In the copy before me Bk. I, c 109, p. 56 is very badly printed, and the same remark applies to c 17, p. 8. Still one cannot expect an *édition de luxe* for two shillings, and nothing here said should be taken to detract from the great and substantial value of this most serviceable and scholarly edition.—R. W. MACAN.

Herodoti Historiarum Liber Quintus. Scholarum in usum edidit ALFRED HOLDER. (Leipzig: Freytag, 1887). *Eiusdem*. Liber Sextus.

WE have here from the same editor two books of Herodotus, published separately, and at a very small price (40 Pf. each). The *apparatus criticus* is absent, in other respects the page is uniform with the critical

edition of the first four books, and very much more correctly printed. Each book is furnished with a summary of contents in Latin, and the sixth has a plan of Marathon to illustrate the battle. The story of Demaratus (VI. 59-70) is rearranged, and purged of those passages, which are no reproach to 'The Father of History,' but are perhaps better omitted in school reading. The text presented is less conservative than Stein's. In VI. 105 Holder boldly reads Φιλίππιδης, which indeed must be right, though Stein has not admitted it into the text. VI. 98 Holder omits altogether; this is a strong measure, probably not to be repeated in the critical edition. These inexpensive and excellent editions of the fifth and sixth books of Herodotus, which probably fit in with school work better than the earlier books, and present less of difficulty at least on the historical side, may be most heartily recommended to those engaged in teaching Greek to boys and girls.—R. W. M.

Ovidii Metamorphoses. Ed. A. ZINGERLE. 1 M. 25 Pf.

Fasti, Tristia, Ibis, Ex Ponto, Halieutica, Fragmenta. Ed. O. GÜTHLING. 2 M.

Carmina selecta. Ed. H. SEDLMAYER. 80 Pf.

THE series of Greek and Latin texts published by Freytag, of which these form a part, deserves to be widely known: the page is broad, the print large, the paper can be written upon with ink; and the price is small. Each volume has an *annotatio critica*, and index of proper names. The part containing the *Heroides* (which has appeared separately) and *Amatory poems* by Sedlmayer is promised. Uniform with the whole is an excellent little volume of selections by Sedlmayer, neatly bound in cloth: and recommended for school purposes to such as prefer the absence of notes.

Zingerle's text of the *Metamorphoses* is based upon M, supplemented where possible by the early British Museum and Berne fragments, in other places by L. The edition is judicious, and distinguished by an infrequency of square brackets and by easiness in the emendations adopted, for which we cannot but feel grateful. Zingerle is conservative on the whole; though numerous emendations are recorded, many of which, though already published in German periodicals, are new to English readers. The best of the editor's own is the convincing *inde incepta* for *indecepta* (ix. 712): *hosti si tibi sum* (ix. 180) seems hardly necessary: *Hersilia aerias* (xiv. 848) is clever, though not convincing: in xi. 138, Schenkl's excellent *nitens* (for *nite*) is admitted; and the same scholar's *nympha larum inpatiens* (iv. 260) is so ingenious that we cannot but regret the oversight which leads him to propose *ducite en omnia habes* (vii. 509). The larger critical edition promised by Zingerle will be looked forward to with interest.

Güthling's work—which may be obtained in separate parts, *Fasti*, 75 Pf., Exile poems, 1 M. 40 Pf.—contains a fresh, though apparently somewhat inexact, collation of the codex Marcianus of the *Tristia*, executed for this edition; a collation of the Wolfenbüttel MS. by Schenkl; and readings from the Monaco excerpts of Politian, supplied by Stangl. The editor's method is eclectic: in the *Fasti* he wisely follows Peter in often allowing the readings of other MSS., especially V, to outweigh those of A. In the *Ibis* Ellis' materials are used, but G is followed more closely than by Ellis. In the Pontic Epistles the Hamburg MS. is the basis: where it is deficient two Monaco MSS. are used, one of them freshly collated by Schenkl. The revision of the *Halieutica* is naturally founded upon Birt's monumental work.

In the *Fasti* there is little new: one slight correction (vi. 765); ten lines marked as spurious, a

doubtful gain (ii. 137-138, 367-368, 835-836, iv. 861-862, vi. 43-44); and a conjecture of Schenkl, *iam sacra uerba* (ii. 638). In the Pontic Epistles there is more: i. 7, 57 *at* for *nee*; ii. 2, 60 *illa meos* is suggested; ii. 5, 24 *putet*; iii. 2, 21 *an* for *aut*; iii. 6, 34 *qui me quod patior*; iv. *existet* for *existat*. An important mistake is corrected in Korn's facsimile of Guelf. iv. 12, 41.

In the *Tristia* the lucidity of the *annotatio critica* is decidedly superior to anything yet published: of emendations iii. 12, 28 *quaeque durae fodiantur*, and v. 12, 19 *esse* for *esse* are excellent; v. 8, 11 *naufragium qui mersit* is probable; the others (ii. 59 *una*, iv. 7, 7 *ci*, ii. 66 *rara mei*, iii. 5, 53 *uenturum*) seem uncertain. Unfortunately there are signs of hasty work, which has led the learned editor into some errors here recorded for correction. In iii. 3, 21 Madv.'s *pāletur*; in iii. 11, 43 Schenkl's *et* for *sed*, each involving a false quantity, should not have been mentioned. In iv. 7, 23 a hasty hint of Riese's has caused '*rara uēnisse manus*' to appear in the text as the end of a pentameter. In iii. 12, 1 the unmetrical *Macotis* in the text should be corrected to *Tomitis*, as appears from the index. The following inaccuracies in reporting the readings of MSS. are due no doubt largely to the press under which collating has often to be executed by scholars whose circumstances straiten the time they would otherwise gladly employ; and liberal indulgence will be made by all who know the difficulty of such thankless labour. ii. 55 G has *hunc animum*: ii. 91 L has *prodesset honesti* not *prodesset et honesti*: ii. 92 L³ has *redditur et* not *redditur at*: ii. 138 should read *paruaque G¹ parcaque G²*: ii. 145 *utque* (for *usque*) not *atque* is read by L¹: ii. 191 *Neureaque* ascribed to Reise is the conjecture of Merula: ii. 239 Merkel reads *fuisses* not *fuisset*: ii. 278 *abrogat* not *arrogat* is read by φ: ii. 285 *eadem* is read by L as well as G: ii. 305 *inrupit* is no MS. reading, but the conjecture of Merkel: ii. 337 L has *delectare* not *detrectare*: ii. 403 L has *peli* not *peliac*: ii. 474 L has *figere* not *ingere*: ii. 492 L has *quedā n ulli* not *quae damno ulli*: ii. 565 *scriptis* conjectured originally by T. Faber, and since found to be the reading of L, is incorrectly described as Merkel's emendation: iii. 1, 39 *apposita*, not *opposita*, is the reading of G: iii. 4, 57 G has *errat* not *errant*: iii. 5, 55 L has *hoc* not *hos*: iii. 6, 16 L has *bonae* not *bonum*: iii. 9, 32 *retardet* not *morctur* is the reading of Merkel ed. min.: iv. 1, 21 L has *inter* not *nee inter*: iv. 2, 53 L¹ has *canentes*: iv. 3, 42 LG have *corpora* not *pectora*: iv. 4, 34 L has *auctori* not *auctori sunt*: iv. 4, 76 G has *ab funere* not *ob funera*: iv. 6, 13 L¹ has *semouētis* not *remouētis*: iv. 7, 18 the reference to Horace should be *Carm.* ii. 17. No doubt these little blemishes will speedily be removed in a second edition: and then Güthling's work will deservedly rank as the standard—as it is at present the most convenient—text of Ovid's later poems; forming a fit companion to Zingerle's text of the *Metamorphoses*, which is certainly the most satisfactory hitherto published.—S. G. OWEN.

Fontes iuris Romani antiqui, edidit C. G. BRUNS.

Edit. Vta, cura TH. MOMMSEN. 8 Mk.

THIS fifth edition of an excellent book comes from the hands of the scholar more capable than any other for this class of work. Mommsen greatly assisted his friend in former editions, and now after Bruns' death has assumed the full responsibility for it. He has done just what might be expected. He has added such laws and documents as have come to light since the fourth edition (1879), and has done all that is possible to verify and ascertain the text. It is

indeed Mommsen's singular merit that he has always set before himself the highest standard of authenticity and accuracy, and spared no pains not only to increase the material for Roman history, law, and literature, but to clear away the growth of fictions and misreadings from material already existing in known texts and inscriptions.

The fourth edition was notably distinguished from the third by including the newly discovered part of the colonial law of Urso (*lex Ursonensis*) B.C. 44; the regulations for the mine at Vipascum and the wax auction-receipts from Pompeii, besides some minor additions. The fifth has a new fragment of a law resembling or identical with the *lex Rubria*, several new *senatusconsulta*, altar-dedications, conveyances, and parts of wills. The texts have all been carefully re-examined with the best editions, the fragments of the praetor's edict have been revised by Otto Lenel, who is the best living authority on the subject, and the extracts from Festus have been compared with fresh collations of the MSS., and in some parts with collations of newly-discovered or re-discovered MSS. For many purposes of Roman law and philology this collection is quite indispensable, and the fifth edition is much better than any of its predecessors. For a small price the legal or classical student has here all that he really requires of the legal monuments which time has spared and we have yet discovered. Mommsen's band of coadjutors and pupils have done much to increase our store, and are fortunately still at work. Chance or purposed search may yet throw up inscriptions, which like the Gortyn tables and some of those in this volume, form distinct additions to our information, and that in the most trustworthy shape.—H. J. R.

C. Vettii Aquilini Iuvenei Libri Evangeliorum IIII. Ad Fidelem Codicum Antiquissimorum recognovit CAROLUS MAROLD. Lipsiae, 1886 (Biblioth. Teubneriana), pp. xvii 119. 1 M. 80 Pf.

THE full name of Iuvenius is here given from the Cambridge MS. (C.C.C.C. 304) 'cuius descriptionem a viro ill. H. Bradshaw confectam Zangemeister (*Sitzungsber. d. Kais. Acad. der Wiss. Phil.-Histor. Cl.* 84, 553 seq.) publici iuris fecit.' This MS. is of the seventh century, and is the best of many (ranging from the eighth to the fifteenth centuries) which the editor has consulted. The footnotes give the principal various readings. An index of names, and another of words and grammar (pp. 107-119) complete this most serviceable edition. Huemer, who in vol. ii. of the *Wiener Studien* published critical remarks on Iuvenius, has undertaken to edit him in the Vienna *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*.

J. E. B. M.

Festi breviarium rerum gestarum populi Romani. Edidit CAROLUS WAGENER. Lips. Freytag, 1886. 8vo. pp. xiv, 23. 50 Pf.

This little tract, written A.D. 369 at the bidding of the emperor Valens, long passed under the name of Sextus Rufus, but Wagener has proved that Festus is the only name which the writer bears in the best MSS.

The early editions are for the most part appended to Justin, Florus, Polybius and especially Eutropius, but the slightness of the work has not deterred two excellent scholars from producing independent critical editions of it, viz. Wendelin Foerster (Vindob. 1874 cf. his essay in the *Wiener Studien* ii 303) and Wagener, whose critical preface, digest of various readings and index, leave nothing to be desired. He

is indebted to Karl Schenkl, Friedrich Luedeke and Gustav Monod for collations respectively of the Vienna, Gotha and Paris MSS.—J. E. B. M.

Flavii Cresconii Corippi Africani Grammatici quae supersunt. Recensuit MICHAEL PETSCHENIG. Berlin, Calvary. 1886. 8vo. pp. xii 261. (*Berliner Studien für Classische Philologie und Archæologie.* Vierter Band. Zweites Heft). Einzelpreis 9 M. 60 Pf.

THE author gives a corrected text with critical apparatus, an 'index nominum et rerum' (pp. 218-230), 'index verborum et locutionum' (pp. 231-260). He is well known as an indefatigable student of the later Latin, and contributed 'Emendations to Corippus' to the *Wiener Studien*, ii-vi (1880-84) and 'Studien zu dem Epiker Corippus' to the *Sitzungsber. der Phil.-Hist. Classe der kais. Akad. der Wiss. in Wien*, 1885, cix 631-668. He has received emendations and other help from (1) Rudolf Amann, author of a dissertation, '*De Corippo Priorum Poetarum Latinorum Imitatore*', Oldenb. 1885, (2) M. Manitius, author of an article 'Zu spätlateinischen Dichtern' I. in the *Zeitschr. f. Oester. Gymn.* 1886, pp. 81-101, (3) Karl Schenkl. This must be regarded as the most convenient edition of the text, though it does not supersede the more elaborate edition of Jos. Parisch (in the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, Berlin, Weidmann, 1879. 4to.).—J. E. B. M.

Virgilii Maronis Grammatici Opera. Edidit IOHANNES HUEMER. Lipsiae 1886. (Biblioth. Teubneriana). pp. xv 177; with 'index auctorum quos citavit Virgilius' (pp. 178-179), 'index nominum' (p. 180), 'index verborum et locutionum' (pp. 181-195). 2 Mk. 40 Pf.

HUEMER is favorably known by his edition of Sedulius (*Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, vol. x) and of *Crundincli Ars Metrica*; he is engaged on Iuvenius for the same Vienna series. Students of late Latin and lexicographers are greatly indebted to the public spirit of the great Leipzig publisher for issuing, necessarily at a loss, works like *Anthimus*, the prose *Atulularia*, *Cassius Felix*, *Dares*, *Diety*, *Fabulae Roman.*, *Historia Apollonii*, *Martianus Capella*, *Plinius et Gargilius Martialis*, *Soranus*, and this grammarian *Virgilius Maro*. Beside the Neapolitan MS. iv A 34 (saec. ix or x) of the *Epitome* and *Epistolar*, which Mai (*Class. Auct.* v 1-149, *append. ad Opera edita ab A. Maio*, Romae, 1871, p. 113-166) used, Huemer has employed several MSS. of the *Epitome*, and has had the help of his former teacher, W. v. Hartel. The value of the book (cited e.g. by Bédé) lies not in the citations, professedly taken from Cicero ('non Arpinas,' as the index quietly remarks), Horace, Lucan et al., but in the barbarous vocabulary, of which only samples are collected in the index.—J. E. B. M.

MONUMENTA GERMANIAE HISTORICA inde ab anno Christi quingentesimo usque ad annum millesimum et quingentesimum edidit societas apud acad. fontibus rerum Germanicarum aucti acri. Berlin, Weidmann. 4to.

THE title of this series tends to obscure its interest for scholars and divines. Each volume has an introduction, parallel passages and various readings under the text, and elaborate indexes of authors cited, subject matter, latinity, etc. In many cases a critical recension of texts appears here for the first time, or after a neglect of two centuries or more.

The readers of the Review can procure elsewhere a list of volumes coming lower down than the *aerum*

Carolinum, which forms a convenient termination for this brief notice. The names of the editors and of the society which they serve, guarantee the excellence of the work. It is printed in two forms on writing paper and on ordinary paper. The price of the latter is given in brackets below.

The first section '*AUCTORES ANTIQUISSIMI*' comprises as yet:

Tom. I pt. 1. SALVIANI *Presbyteri Massiliensis libri qui supersunt. Recensuit* CAROLUS HALM. 1877. pp. vii 176. 7 M. 50 Pf. (5 M.).

Tom. I pt. 2. EUGIPPII *vita Sancti Severini. Recensuit et adnotavit* HERMANNUS SAUPE. 1877. pp. xvii 36. 2 M. 40 Pf. (1 M. 60 Pf.).

Tom. II. EUTROPII *breviarium ab urbe condita cum versionibus Gracis et PAULI LANDOLFIQUE additamentis. Recensuit et adnotavit* H. DROYSSEN. 1879. pp. lxxii 430. 24 M. (16 M.).

Tom. III pt. 1. VICTORIS VITENSIS *historia persecutionis Africanae provinciae sub Geiserico et Hunrico regibus Wandalorum. Recensuit* CAROLUS HALM. 1879. pp. x 90. 4 M. 60 Pf. (3 M.).

Tom. III pt. 2. CORIPPI *Africani grammatici libri qui supersunt. Recensuit* IOSEPHUS PARTSCH. 1879. pp. lxii 195. 12 M. (8 M.).

Tom. IV pt. 1. VENANTI HONORI CLEMENTIANI *FORTUNATI presbyteri Italici opera poetica. Recensuit* FRIDERICUS LEO. 1881. pp. xxvii 427. 18 M. (12 M.).

Tom. IV pt. 2. VENANTI...*opera pedestria. Recensuit* BRUNO KRUSCH. 1885. pp. xxiv 144. 9 M. 6 M.).

Tom. V pt. 1. IORDANIS *Romana et Getica. Recensuit* THEODORUS MOMMSEN. 1882. pp. lxxiii 200. 12 M. (8 M.).

Tom. V pt. 2. D. MAGNI AUSONII *opuscula. Recensuit* CAROLUS SCHENKL. 1883. pp. lxiv 302. 15 M. (10 M.). In this edition the spurious works are separated from the genuine.

Tom. VI pt. 1. Q. AURELII SYMMACHI *quae supersunt. Edidit* OTTO SEECK. 1883. pp. ccviii 352. 22 M. (15 M.).

Tom. VI pt. 2. ALCIMI ECDICII AVITI *Viennensis episcopi opera quae supersunt. Recensuit* RUDOLPHUS PEIPER. 1883. pp. lxxvi 376. 18 M. (12 M.).

Tom. VII. MAGNI FELICIS ENNODI *opera recensuit* FRIDERICUS VOGEL. 1885. pp. lxiv 420. 20 M. (13 M.).

Of another section '*POETARUM LATINORUM MEDII AEVI*,' have as yet appeared:

POETAE LATINI AEVI CAROLINI.

Tom. I. *Recensuit* ERNESTUS DUEMMER. 1881. pp. 652. 25 M. 50 Pf. (17 M.).

Contains e.g. Bonifatii carmina. Appendix carminum Anglicorum. Iosephi Scotti carmina. Alcuin carmina.

Tom. II. *Recensuit* ERNESTUS DUEMMER. 1884. pp. vi 722. 28 M. 50 Pf. (19 M.).

Tom. III pt. 1. *Recensuit* LUDOVICUS TRAUBE. 1886. pp. vi 265.

Contains e.g. Sedulii Scotti carmina. Part 2, by A. G. HARSTER, containing the indexes, will shortly appear.

Of another section published by Hahn at Hannover in the same form we have:

SCRIPTORES RERUM MEROVINGICARUM.

Tom. I. GREGORII TURONENSIS *opera. Ediderunt* W. ARNDT et BR. KRUSCH. 1884-5. pp. ix 964.

A most valuable help to the study of late Latin, with very complete indexes.

SCRIPTORES RERUM LANGOBARDICARUM ET ITALICARUM SAEC. VI-IX. Hannover, Hahn. 4to. pp. vi 636.

Contains *inter alia* 'Pauli historia Langobardorum edentibus L. Bethmann et G. Waitz' and 'Agnelli qui et Andreas liber pontificalis ecclesiae Ravennatis ed. O. Holder-Egger.'

Another important series contains the *LAWS*, Hannover, Hahn. 4to.

LEGUM SECTIO II. CAPITULARIA REGUM FRANCORUM. *Denuo edidit* ALFREDUS BORETUS.

Tom. I. 1883. pp. xii 462.

LEGUM SECTIO V. FORMULAE MEROWINGICI ET KAROLINI AEVI. *Accedunt ORDINES IUDICIORUM DEI. Edidit* KAROLUS ZEUMER. 1886. pp. xx 782.

Invaluable for an editor of Ducange—J. E. B. M.

The Odyssey of Homer, I.—XII. Translated into English verse. By the EARL OF CARNARVON. Macmillan & Co. London. 1886. 7s. 6d.

It is no small praise to say of a translation that it is exact, and elegant, and readable; and so much may be said of Lord Carnarvon's version of the first half of the *Odyssey*. Yet it is a very inadequate representation of Homer. Where then is its fault? This may be found we think, in the second of the three epithets that we have applied to it. It is elegant, most un-Homerically elegant. We take, for instance, from the description of the second stream in the Garden of Alcinous, the phrase "yields the citizens its limpid wealth." The Greek is ὕδεν ὑδρεύοντο πολῖται, a simple, direct expression as unlike as possible to such a very 'Virgilian' phrase, if we may so say, as 'limpid wealth.' A little further on comes the passage where Odysseus tells his host with an almost brutal plainness that whatever a man's sorrows, he must yet eat. Mr. Lewis Way gives it thus:—

'For no such shameless thing as the ravening belly is found,
For it biddeth us bear it in mind, and by strong constraint we are bound,
Though never so much woe-worn, heart-laden with anguish sore,
Even as the anguish of heart that is mine; yet this evermore,
This shameful, shameless thing, crieth on me to eat and to drink,
Bidding me fill it, and suffers me not of my trouble to think.'

This is really Homeric, though perhaps a little exaggerated. But Lord Carnarvon polishes it into this:—

'there is nought
E'en to the trouble-laden, as the sting
Of hunger, which hath a remembrance keen
In hour of need or sorrow. So the grief
That fills my soul now bids me eat and drink,
And dulls the memory of labours past.'

Instances of the same characteristic defect might be multiplied indefinitely. Perhaps it could hardly have been avoided after the initial mistake of the choice of a metre. To be Homeric in the highly artificial rhythm of blank verse is nothing less than impossible.

How does Lord Carnarvon handle this same metre? Skilfully enough in passages of an elevated kind, differently in those of the humbler sort, but never, we think, with a thorough mastery. In the quotation already given, the third line, 'Of hunger which hath a remembrance keen,' is distinctly bad, so very weak are the words in the middle of the verse. The line that follows 'limpid wealth,' is, to say the least, feeble—

'Such gifts the gods gave to Alcinous.'

Here is a specimen of the translator's better manner:—

'On the broad hearth the goodly flame burnt bright,
And through the isle was wafted far and wide
The scent of frankincense and cedar log.
Within she sat; and bending o'er the loom
Wrought with her golden shuttle on the web,
And ever as she wrought sang with clear voice.
Around that grotto grew a goodly grove,
Alder and poplar and the cypress sweet;
And there the deep-winged sea-birds found their
home,
And owls and hawks and long-tongued cormorants,
Who joy to live upon the briny flood.
And o'er the face of that deep cave a vine
Wove its wild tangles and its clustering grapes,
Four fountains too, each from the other turned,
Poured their white waters, whilst the grassy meads
Bloomed with the parsley and the violet's flower.'

The Odyssey of Homer. Done into English verse by
WILLIAM MORRIS. Vol. I. (Reeves and Turner). 12s.

In view of the ideal arrangement that a poem should be translated by a poet, one is apt to overlook that humble virtue of accuracy which requires nothing more than industry backed by an adequate amount of scholarship. It is in this that, while examining with some care one of the books (the seventh) which he has translated, we find Mr. Morris somewhat wanting. His most serious mistake is in ll. 318, 9, where Alcinoüs promises that Odysseus should be sent home, and adds that he shall be asleep while the rowers do their work.

τῆμος δὲ σὺ μὲν δεδμημένος ὕπνῳ
λέξῃαι οἱ δ' ἔλῳσι γαλήνῃν, κ.τ.λ.

Mr. Morris has—

'So lie down meanwhile, thou heavy laden
with sleep,
They shall drive through the calm of the sea-flood'
etc;

apparently taking λέξῃαι for λέξῃο, and, what is not less serious, forgetting the important part that this sleep of Odysseus on shipboard plays in the story. In 261 the chronology of the story is upset by the version

'But when the ninth year of my sojourn round his
circling course had won.'

Ninth' is, of course, a mere lapse of the pen; the other error is more important, ἐπιπλόμενον ἦλθε means something like 'approaching came,' or, we might say, 'was just come.' Odysseus was exactly seven years in his island prison: with the eight came the prospect of escape. In the description of the women weaving we have the line

'A-sitting e'en as the leaves are of the poplars high
o'erhead.'

One explanation of the simile, it is true, makes it to be a likening of the crowd of women to the number of leaves, but there can be no question about the superiority of that which refers it to the swift glancing of their hands, or, possibly, of the shuttles. In 232 *ἔντεα δαιτός* does not mean 'remnants of the feast' but 'furniture of the feast,' the 'banquet-year,' as Mr. Way puts it. 'Sleep that had no limit' is not a happy rendering of ὕπνον ἀπέριον making it far too like ἀτέριον (a resemblance already so strong that ἀπήμιον has been conjectured). Mr. Way's 'deep, deep sleep' is better, as is also his 'swift white flame of the levin' than 'thunder white.' In 81 *Ἐρεχθῆος περικλυτὸν δόμον* can scarcely be rendered by

'Erechtheus' homestead and his steadfast house.' It must mean the temple which Erechtheus built.

When we come to speak of the literary merits of Mr. Morris' translation we enter on debatable ground. He uses a peculiar dialect which can only be ironically defended by the allegation that the Homeric dialect also, like Spenser's in English, is a cento of usages which never prevailed at any one place and time. In his very first line he employs what we cannot but think the most unhappy equivalent of 'Shifty' for πολύτροπος. 'Shifty' has a sinister signification which does not attach to the substantive 'shift,' so that 'shifty' will not pass as a substitute for 'of many shifts.' Then we have such phrases as 'Thunder-fain,' to 'flit' used apparently for to 'carry' and to 'work' (the Phaeacians are said to have 'flitted' Rhadamanthus and the women 'flit' their work), 'cornkind,' 'black-cloudy,' 'sheer out-thrusting nesses,' 'sheep-kind,' etc. But these, it may be said, are petty criticisms; what is the impression made by the whole? Briefly this—that there is much delicate workmanship, much sweetness of rhythm and melody, many *lumina verborum*, but that there is a want of clearness and rapidity and sometimes a want of force. In these it is inferior to Mr. Way's work, but it has an inspiration to which its older rival cannot pretend. But the reader shall have such an opportunity as our space allows of judging for himself.

'Seven days and ten did I sail, and passed the salt-seas o'er,
But on the eighteenth day showed the shadowy mountain shore
Of your land, and thereat, poor wretch! the heart rejoiced in me.
But yet of the plenteous trouble yoke-mate was I to be
Which Poseidon the Earth-shaker against my life did raise;
For he stirred up the winds against me, and bound me aback from my ways,
And piled up a sea most monstrous, whose swell would not suffer me
To be borne along bewailing and still on the raft to be.
Then the storm-blast scattered it wide, and swimming on I clave
The mighty gulf of the sea-flood until the wind and the wave
Had borne me on and brought me to this your land anigh;
But the swell as I strove to land 'gainst the sea-cliffs mightily
Drove on perforce, and my body in an ugly place would have cast.
But back I went a-swimming until I came at last
To the river, and there indeed at the place that was most to my mind
All smooth of rocks, and sheltered against the drift of the wind,
I fell ashore, gathering my spirit; but the Deathless Night came on,
And thence I gat me away; from the Zeus-fed river I won,
And lay me down to sleep in the thicket, and the leaves all over me spread,
And sleep that had no limit the God about me shed.
There then amidst the leafage, despite my sorrow sore,
Nightlong I slept till morning and the hindmost day was o'er,
And the Sun again was setting when sweet sleep went from me.

Then the handmaids of thy daughter on the beach
there did I see
All a-sporting; and amidst them as a goddess was
she fair.
I besought her; and surely of wisdom hath her
soul a goodly share,
Nor indeed could one ever be hoping on a youngling
thus to hit
Would do as she; since the younger be ever wanting
in wit.'

MODERN LATIN VERSE FROM MOSCOW AND BERLIN.

1. *Στέφανος*. *Carmina sua Græca et Latina*. THEODORUS KORSCH. Copenhagen. Gyldendal.
2. *Cupressi*. C. A. ULRICHs.

THE first of these is a collection of Latin and Greek odes and epigrams, some original, some translations. The author is happiest in his imitations of Martial, and so life-like are the touches that one is tempted to think Bianor has an original in Russia. There is rough vigour in a translation of Puschkin (lxviii.), in the style of an Horatian epode; and No. vi., an ode of congratulation to a fellow-professor, is full of graceful feeling. Our space only permits us to quote a short average specimen, which may be enough however to show the writer's ease of versification:—

'Commendo tibi, docte Thore Langi,
Quam scripsi modo disputationem.
Haec si digna tibi videtur esse,
Quam Madvigius, omnium magister,
Cenatus legat aut recens lavatus,
Cum cessant animi subinde motus
Mensque odit gravibus vacare curis,—
Hunc, inquam, nisi respuis libellum,
Per te moenia visat Hauniana,
Ut sit mnemosynum, licet pusillum,
Ex quo vivere me sciant sodales.'

The Greek epigrams are generally archaic in style and language, and do not strike us as of equal merit with the Latin. The little volume well deserves perusal by Englishmen who are interested in this branch of scholarship, and who are perhaps too much disposed to regard it as scarcely existing out of their own country.

We cannot speak equally highly of *Cupressi*, elegies in memory of the late King of Bavaria, by C. A. Ulrichs. They are written for the most part in an anapaestic metre, for examples of which we must go far down in the silver age, and might fail even there in finding its exact prototype.

La Vie des Mots, par ARSÈNE DARMESTETER. Paris, Librairie C. H. Delagrave, 1887. 2 fr.

THIS little book is the outcome of five lectures delivered at the Sorbonne in 1885, and presents certain general conclusions arrived at by the author during his special study of the French language. It is not an historical account of changes in the meaning of words but an inquiry into the relation of words to the ideas they express, and the conditions which underlie the evolution of meaning. In a short introduction the author has stated the problems of linguistic science and its methods. At each period of its history a language is in a state of equilibrium between the conservative influence of custom and tradition and the revolutionary working of Phonetic Change and Analogy. Where the tradition is fixed as in Classical Latin, which ignored the changes of popular speech, the language dies. Where there is no fixed tradition, language can

change, as with some savage tribes, from generation to generation so quickly that the old cannot understand the young.

Of the destructive agencies, Phonetic Change embraces the changes of sound which can be traced in the history of languages, whether considered singly or in groups—changes produced so regularly that the laws, under which they are generalized, may be regarded as without exception. The principle of Analogy or Association on the other hand is psychological in its character. Under this principle men replace variety by uniformity, alter older systems of inflexion and create new words. In French for instance *nous amons* once stood beside *il aime*, and *il trueve* beside *nous trouvons*. In modern French the tenses are uniform throughout. By Analogy a special mode of formation becomes favourite. Thus on the analogy of *imbutus*, *cognodutus* takes the place of *cognitus* and gives rise to the French *connu*. The working of Analogy may be traced not only in inflexions and the formation of words but in the constructions of Syntax as well.

The two principles of Phonetic Change and Analogy are of great importance in the history of modern Philology, particularly as regards the ancient Classical languages. Yet though accepted in France and Germany they have hitherto received but scant recognition in England.

The work of M. Darmesteter is concerned with changes of meaning, not with changes of form. Why is it that new words are created, and that old words receive new senses, while others disappear? These questions the author considers under their logical, psychological and philological aspects. Under logical conditions he applies the figures of the grammarians, *συνεκδοχή*, *μετωνυμία*, *μεταφορά*, *κατάχρησις* to the transformations of meaning in French words. All these changes are embraced under the processes of *rayonnement*, by which such a word as *root* is extended to a whole series of different meanings, and *enchaînement* by which a word loses touch of its primitive meaning and is transferred to other objects, as for instance in the case of *mouchoir*.

From the psychological side we have to consider the effect on language of the changes of thought and feeling brought about by great historical events; or again the effects of national and race characteristics, as for instance in the want of abstract terms in Hebrew, or the connection of the idea of falsity with the number *two* in Aryan languages. Under this head too come the effects of want of precision or grossness in popular notions, as seen in the wavering sense of terms of colour or the depravation of such terms as *philosophe*, *sophistiquier*, *jovial*.

In the latter portion of the book the author considers the action and reaction of words upon one another—how for instance *point* and *rien* have lost all positive meaning because of their restriction to set phrases, how one word ousts another as when *falloir* takes the place of the older *estover* and *convenir*, and yet again how synonyms exist side by side.

Lastly he touches on the reasons of the disappearance of words. Ten 4to volumes contains the disused terms of the French language. Some disappeared along with the object and ideas which they expressed; others because they were not clear or did not please. The Latin *ire* has left no *ir*, French uses *aller*; *verum* has left *vrai* but *veru* and *virum* have left nothing. In trying to find an equivalent for English *maid* French has passed from *garce* to *fille*, and from *fille* to *une jeune personne*.

To M. Darmesteter Language is an organism passing through an endless succession of develop-

ments. Language has its fossil remains of past formations now disused. In Language too we find a struggle for existence continually going on, and linguistic study is the history of the evolutions through which in different times and places the primitive type has passed.—J. E. KING.

Cours élémentaire d'épigraphie latine, par M. CAGNAT.
Paris: Thorin. 1886. Pp. x. 221. 8vo. 6 fr.

IN his article on 'Roman Inscriptions,' contributed to the *Encyclopædia Britannica* in 1881, Hübner complained that there was no text-book of Roman epigraphy in existence. Since then two have appeared, one by Hübner himself in Iwan Müller's *Handbuch* (i. pp. 475-548), the other the one which we have now to review. It consists of two parts, first, 'the elements common to different classes of inscriptions,' which includes the names of men, the *cursus honorum* and the imperial titles (pp. 1-118): second, the different classes of inscriptions (pp. 119-188). There is a 'complementary' chapter on restoring mutilated inscriptions, and a full index. That the book is good we need hardly say. The growth of classical studies in France has been more marked in epigraphy than in anything else, and M. Cagnat is not the least known among French epigraphists. And when his book has received Hübner's approval, what more is there to add? It is of course elementary. We almost think, indeed, it might here and there have been made even more so in detail: the abbreviations O. for Aulus, QV. for Quintus, S. for Servius, and others (pp. 6, 27) are very rare. But with epigraphy in the strict sense of the word—the forms, shapes, and combinations of letters—the book does not deal. There is a note on p. 75 on the accent denoting a long syllable; another on p. 193 just alludes to ligatures: but that is almost all. On the other hand, some parts of the book are not epigraphical in any special sense. The section on the transmission of names (pp. 30-44) corresponds to some of the first section of Marquardt's *Privatleben*, and the *cursus honorum* (pp. 53-97) is part of a *Römisches Staatsrecht*. However, the inclusion of these points does not render the book a bit the less useful, and its lucidity is admirable. There is some want of examples, particularly in the middle of the book, but we understand a supplement is speedily to follow, which will contain them. The print is excellent. At the bottom of p. 18 the reference should be to *Privatleben*, i.—F. HAVERFIELD.

Cours élémentaire de métrique grecque et latine, par LOUIS HAVET, rédigé par LOUIS DUVAU. Paris: Delagrave. 1886. 4 fr.

THIS little treatise gives a trustworthy account of the principal Greek and Latin metres in a popular form. The introduction deals with accentuation and prosody, and distinguishes clearly between the different kinds of accent and quantity. Some rules are given for determining the natural quantity of Latin vowels in syllables which are long by position, a subject which is too often neglected. The bulk of the book consists of chapters on the following subjects: dactylic, anapaestic, trochaic, and iambic verse, the Lesbian lyrical poetry, pæonic and ionic verse, the general principles of choral metres, rhythmical verse in later Greek and Latin poetry. The Greek and Latin hexameter and elegiac are discussed at length, and the peculiarities of Homeric prosody are well stated, though exception might be taken to one or two matters of detail. The principal trochaic and iambic metres are also adequately described, as well as the difference in Latin poetry between the archaic prosody (especially that of the

dramatists) and the prosody of the classical period. The treatment of the lyrical metres is less complete, but so far as it goes, is sound and cautious. Thus, the disputed question of the exact relation between the so-called 'cyclic' dactyl and the trochee in logaoedic metres is stated as follows: 'The proper value of each syllable was probably altered a little, so that the strong beats came at equal intervals from one another.' This is a much safer statement than the account of the 'cyclic' dactyl which is now usually given. The theory of the exact correspondences between the rhythmical 'sentences' that form a period in choral metres, i.e. the so-called 'eurhythmy' is wisely passed over without notice in a book which professes only to give ascertained facts. But the chapters on lyrical and choral metres are too short, and such important metres as dochmiacs and dactylo-epitritics should not be relegated to the glossary at the end of the book, where a mere definition is given, without any discussion. The same may be said of the Saturnian metre. In spite however of some omissions, and although some parts require to be more worked up in detail, the book is probably in its present form the best easy introduction to the study of Greek and Latin metres. The style is clear, and the terminology as simple as possible. There are a few misleading misprints, which should be corrected in a second edition.—C. B. HEBERDEN.

Allgriechischer Versbau, ein Versuch vergleichender Metrik, von H. USENER, Bonn, 1887. 2 Mk. 80 Pf.

ARISTOTLE records that theorists in his own day defined the typical hexameter as consisting of seventeen syllables in two divisions, the left division numbering eight, the right nine. It is the chief object of Usener's treatise to show that this theoretical division, viz.

— — — — — | — — — — —

was originally a real one, the hexameter having been formed by the fusion of two lines which, though together making a couplet, were metrically separate. Bergk vainly sought the origin of the Epic metre in a mechanical combination of the 'enoplios' with the so-called 'paroemiac.' The latter term really denotes nothing more than the anapaestic 'marching' verse (adapted for singing *παρ' ὀλμον*). Usener, though he rejects Bergk's theory, unfortunately interprets the word as if derived from *παροιμία* (following Hephaestion, ch. 8), and makes use of it accordingly to denote the short verse (*Kurzvers*), which his own theory presupposes. Apart from the name, however, there is no doubt that a verse, corresponding more or less closely to the latter half of the hexameter, very frequently appears as the vehicle of gnomic sayings (e.g. *φιλεῖ δὲ νότος μετὰ πάχην*), while similar sentences, embodied in hexameter verse, often take the same metrical form, e.g. Homer's *βεχθὲν δέ τε νήπιος ἔγνω*, and Hesiod's *παθὼν δέ τε νήπιος ἔγνω*. No less than 115 gnomic sentences of this type have been collected by Meineke, Nauck and others. The inference, that the hexameter was originally composite, is obviously a legitimate one. The fragment of a Linus song preserved by the Scholiast on *Iliad* xviii. 570 is a succession of these wrongly-named 'paroemiacs,' adapted, perhaps, to a circular dance.

Usener derives additional evidence from two sources. First, from the frequent neglect of the digamma in Homer after the caesura, e.g.

πᾶσιν ἐμοὶ δὲ μάλιστα | τοὶ Φίλιφ' ἐγγεγάσιν
εἰ δὴ σοὶ πᾶν ἔργον | ὑποφείζομαι ὅττι κε Φείπης
ἄλλ' ἄγε νῆα μέλαιναν | Φερύσσομεν εἰς ἄλα διὰν
ἔς ἔφατ'. Αἰρέλας δὲ | Φεκατηβόλον Ἀπόλλωνα.

Such lines, he supposes, were allowed because of the semi-independence of the concluding half of the hexameter. He would similarly explain some exceptions to the usual lengthening of the vowel before a mute and liquid, e.g.

καὶ ποτέ τις Φείπησι | πατρός γ' ὅδε πολλὸν ἀμείνων
ὀχθήσας δ' ἄρα Φεῖπε | πρὸς Ἰὸν μεγάλητορα θυμόν

On the other hand the unjustified offences of the line

Ζεὺς δὲ πρὸς Ἰὸν λέχος ἦι' Ὀλύμπιος ἀστεροπητής
conclusively prove the passage (Il. i. 609-11) to be merely a rhapsodist's addition. ποτί should of course be written for πρὸς in the formula *Φεῖπε πτερύοντα προσήδα* (Cf. Stesichorus fr. 92 ποταύδη.)

Secondly, from the hexameters which so often occur in inscriptions, e.g. the common formula of imprecation

ὄρφανὰ τέκνα λίποιτο | χῆρον βίον, οἶκον ἔρημον

He ingeniously applies the same key to several difficult inscriptions, e.g.

Διογεν[ής] ἀνέθηκεν | Αἰσχύλου υἱὸς Κεφ[α]λῆος,

where the demotic designation is transferred to the father and the word for 'son' is added in order to obtain a clumsy verse, in which the second half commences independently (*Αἰσσχ | υλου υ | υς Κεφαλ- | ῆος*). The name is elsewhere written *Αἰσχυλλος*. Occasionally he goes too far in detecting the primitive metre in personal names, e.g.

Φανοκρίτη | παιδί χαριζομένη
'Αρχεστράτην | ἀνδρὶ ποθεινοτάτην

The name appears to be often introduced, of necessity, with hardly a semblance of rhythm, as in the well-known inscription on a helmet in the British Museum, in which Hiero dedicates his Etruscan spoils to Zeus: 'Ιάρων ὁ Δεινομένεος—καὶ τοὶ Συρακόσιοι τῷ Διὶ Τυρ(ρ)αν' ἀπὸ Κύμας. He notices with more reason the interpunction which sometimes appears, as in the metrical inscription on a ἀλτήρ recently found at Eleusis:

'Αλ(λ)όμενος νίκησεν | Ἐπαίνετος οὐνεκα τοῦδε

That the hexameter originated in a couplet, the conclusion of which is represented by the verse in question, is rendered highly probable by the analogy now established between the Greek Epic metre and the primitive metres of other European nations, together with the more rudimentary structure of the Vedic hymns and the Zend-avesta. The latter was first analysed by Westphal, who showed that it consists of lines arranged in pairs, each line having four beats, commencing with a light syllable and ending with the ictus. Professor Allen has already traced the old German ballad-metre to the same source. In this the first or light syllable was dropped, so as to give a trochaic rhythm, and the syllable preceding the final ictus suppressed (as sometimes in the Indian metre). Usener's investigation extends to the primitive songs of the Czechs, Poles, Russians, Servians, etc., and his conclusion is that 'they all started from the short verse of eight syllables, and all alike accented it by the four beats.' The connection of the Greek metre with the Vedic is the more manifest, as both depend on quantity and not, like the German, on accent. Its relation to the Saturnian verse is noticed in my article on 'the Aeolic element in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.'

Usener's view of the Aeolian metres favours the suggestion, which I have there offered, as to their affinity with what may be called the rudiments of the hexameter. The primitive rhythm is discernible, not only in the formal logaoedic sequences, but in

the simpler variations preserved in fragments, such as

ἄγε δὲ χέλυ διὰ μοι
πλήρης μὲν ἐφαίνεται' ἂ σελάσσα
ἄλλοτα μὲν μελιάδεος ἄλλοτα δ'
καὶ πλείστοις ἔανασσε λάοις.

Usener points out also that the Lesbian metres preserved the regular beats and definite intervals, which were alone compatible with the accompaniment of the lyre (the Lesbian instrument *par excellence*), remarking that that instrument in Greece was struck, not twanged. The long-drawn choric rhythms were only made possible by the flute. In the metres adapted to the lyre there is no resolution of the arsis. This principle belongs to the Epic in common with the Lesbian metres, and the reason is that the latter 'had been drawn from the manifold forms of the popular poetry and were shaped at a time, undoubtedly long before Alcaeus, when metre was determined by the stringed instrument alone; they faithfully preserved the tradition of a verse-structure, in which the arsis supported the rhythm and the theses were not counted'.—G. C. WARR.

Écriture et Prononciation du Latin Savant et du Latin Populaire, et Appendice sur le chant dit les Frères Arvales, par GEORGES ÉDON, Professeur au Lycée Henri IV: Paris, Librairie Classique Eugène Belin, 1882. 10 fr.

Restitution et Nouvelle Interprétation du Chant dit des Frères Arvales, par GEORGES ÉDON. Paris 1882.

Nouvelle Étude sur le Chant Lémural, par GEORGES ÉDON. Paris 1884. 7 fr. 50.

THE first of M. Édon's books is a very handy and readable summary of all that Corssen, Ritschl, Schuchardt, and subsequent workers in the same field have written about the alphabet, the pronunciation and the accentuation of Latin. M. Édon has read carefully the whole literature of the subject; and his book, though too slight and unoriginal for the special student, may be recommended to any who are content to get their information at second hand. We have in the first chapter an account of the derivation of the Latin alphabet from the Greek, and of the latter from the Phœnician, and ultimately the Egyptian, while with regard to one of the letters, G, we have on p. 145 the interesting information (almost the only original contribution in the book), that the letter *is* to be found on the *as libralis* of Luceria (c. 300-250 B.C.). This was denied by Ritschl and Mommsen, who could only go by hearsay evidence on the subject, since the coin was in a private collection. It has quite recently been acquired by the Naples Museum, and now that it is in public ownership, M. Édon has been able to get a facsimile of it taken (p. 144), which clearly shows that the letter is G and not C. Chapter II gives a very brief account (with specimens) of the various kinds of Latin writing, Capital, Uncial, Cursive, and Minuscule. Chapter III deals with Latin pronunciation in a way that would have been more satisfactory if the contributions of Seelmann, whose book appeared subsequently to M. Édon's, could have been utilized. In Chapter IV we have an extremely good account, with specimens from inscriptions, of the various changes in Latin spelling in the successive centuries of Roman history till the fall of the Western Empire. Chapter V gives the ordinary metrical rules of quantity, while Chapter VI is reserved for the discussion of the law of position, and its violation by Plautus and Terence. The last chapter is devoted to Latin accentuation.

In the Appendix, and in its separate reprint the *Restitution et Nouvelle Interprétation*, &c., we have M. Édon's extraordinary theory about the Hymn of the Arval Brothers, known to most of us in Mommsen's version. The writing is very bad, and the text full of corruptions, to judge from the variations in the same phrase when repeated, and from the misspellings in the previous part of the inscription, which gives the minutes of the proceedings of the Arval priesthood on May 29, 218 A.D. For example *cathedris* is there spelt *cathedius*, and the unmeaning word *lumemulia* appears a line or two above the hymn:—*ibē (sic) om̄ lumemulia cum rapinīs acceperunt et deas unguentaverunt et aedes clusae omnes foris exierunt ibi sacerdotes clusi succincti libellis acceptis carmen descendentes (sic) tripodaverunt in verba haec enos luses iuvate*, &c. We know nothing of the ceremonies referred to in the hymn, and most people are agreed that under the circumstances a restoration of the text is hopeless, although it is surprising in how many books one sees the statement '*plcores=plures* is found in the Arval Hymn,' as if the reading were a certainty. But we do know from a passage in Ovid's *Fasti* v. 435 foll. the ceremonies of the worship of the Lemures. Accordingly M. Édon has conceived the extraordinary idea of transforming the unknown into a known quantity, the Arval into a Lemural hymn. He reads *Lemuralia* for *lumemulia*, and twists the text into what in ordinary Latin would read—

O nos, Lares, iurate! His mihi luam fabis; umbra, serpe, incurre iis! Inde foras satur fuge, Lemur: limen salī! (stabit aversim). Manes paterni, adulate! (cuncti). O! nos, umbra, iurato! Triumphe.

In his translation:—

O Lares, soyez-nous favorables! Je paierai pour moi avec ces fèves. Ombre, glisse-toi, cours après elles! Maintenant que tu en as assez, fuis hors de ce lieu. Lémure; saute le seul. (On s'arrêtera en tournant le dos). Manes paternels, envolez-vous. (Tous ensemble). O ombre, sois-nous favorable! Triomphe!

How does he effect this violent transformation? He has recourse to Ribbeck's favourite recipe for corrupt lines in Virgil, the theory of 'an archetype written in cursive character.' The statuary, he says, must have copied the hymn from one of the *libelli* mentioned in the lines of the inscription quoted above. The *libellus* was written in the same cursive scrawl as we see on the walls of Pompeii, and he is at pains to show how each word of the inscription could be mistaken for the corresponding word in his text when written in cursive.

Such a theory not unnaturally provoked a storm of criticism, and M. Édon was called upon to answer such questions as these:

How could *his, fabis* be written *hi, farr*? How could the Arvalian priesthood tolerate the existence of so mistaken an inscription in their temple? How can *Marnar Umbra* and so forth. He has accordingly written a second book to justify his theory, the *Nouvelle Étude sur le Chant Lemural*, in which these objections are met with an ingenuity worthy of a better cause. Into his speculations we will not follow him, but content ourselves with expressing our opinion that the theory is not worth a moment's consideration.—W. M. LINDSAY.

in this work. It contains an attempt to collect and criticize all the available materials, and to deduce results from them in accordance with physical and economic laws. The book falls naturally into two parts; the first two chapters discuss the nature of the evidence which has come down to us, and the method in which it must be employed, while the bulk of the book is occupied with the application of the principles so established to the different states in detail.

Little fresh material has been brought to light; the data, with which Dr. Beloch works, differ little from those used by Böckh and his successors, but the conclusions drawn by him show the widest divergence from those of former historians. In almost every case numbers hitherto accepted have been greatly reduced. Apart from the interpretation of the original authorities, the most important cause of this divergence lies in the different theories held as to the proportion existing between the adult men and the whole body of men, women, and children. For our information as to the population of the various states is usually limited to the number of adult male citizens (as in the Roman census of the republican period), or of men liable to military service. To ascertain, therefore, the total population, we must first establish or assume what proportion these classes bear to the rest; and here the widest differences of opinion exist. Böckh, following Sainte Croix, thought that the relation of free men to the total free population was as 1 to $4\frac{1}{2}$; Dr. Beloch thinks the proportion of 1 to 3 approximate as an average for all ancient states, and quotes in support the analogy of the different European countries to-day, where the children under seventeen form about thirty-seven per cent of the total, while he supposes that they were not more than thirty-three per cent in antiquity. The importance of this question cannot be overrated, as the estimate of Böckh would make the population half as much again as that of Dr. Beloch. On this account it is to be regretted that the latter author has only devoted a few pages to the discussion of the subject, assuming almost without argument that the rate of increase was always less than the present European average. He further assumes the same proportion to exist at different places and periods, in which the circumstances must have varied considerably. For example he calculates the population of Attica in 432, when it was at its highest, on the same basis as in 309 when it was much lower, and had come to a standstill.

One or two instances in which Dr. Beloch's investigations have led to important reductions may be mentioned. He regards the number of slaves in Attica in 309 quoted by Athenæus as impossible, and after an examination of the value of property at the time, of the amount of corn produced and imported, and the statements as to the slaves owned by the rich, argues that 100,000 is a much more probable number than 400,000. Again, he reduces the population of Italy under Augustus, which has been estimated at seventeen millions to about five and a half millions. He holds that the census of Augustus included the total citizen population, not merely the adult citizens; and bases his conclusion on a comparison of this census with the last census of the Republic.

The causes of the decline in population, which set in both in Greece and Italy in the second century before Christ are only suggested; and as this subject is of the greatest interest to the general student of history, it may be hoped that the researches which Dr. Beloch is undertaking for his next volume, may enable him to treat the question more satisfactorily.

The chief value of the book consists in its destructive criticism. Considerations of physical

Revue de l'Épigraphie, 1896, p. 106. *Revue de l'Épigraphie*, 1896, p. 106. *Revue de l'Épigraphie*, 1896, p. 106.

THE subject of population in antiquity has never received more thorough and scientific treatment than

possibility, such as the amount of corn required to support existence, the density of population in proportion to area, together with more direct arguments are often sufficient to disprove the excessive estimates of former writers. But from the nature of the case, positive conclusions drawn from scanty materials and *a priori* considerations must be in great part hypothetical. Dr. Beloch repeatedly warns us against regarding his results as anything more than approximations to the truth.—L. WHIBLEY.

Vormundschaft nach Attischem Recht. By DR. O. SCHULTHESS. Freiburg-i-B. 1886. 6 Mk.

DR. SCHULTHESS divides the subject of 'Guardianship according to Attic Law' into seven sections, each of which he treats in a separate chapter: the Archon as state protector of orphans and the ὀρφανοφύλακες in Xen. *de red.* 2, 7 etc.—state help given to the orphans of those killed in war—names (ἐπίτροπος and κύριος) and qualifications of a guardian—different kinds of guardians (*testamentarii, legitimi, dativi*) and their appointment, and in an appendix the πρόδικος in Sparta—duties of a guardian—time and mode of the orphan's release from guardianship—litigation which might arise out of guardianship (εἰσαγγελία κακώσεως, φάσις μισθώσεως οἴκου, and δίκη ἐπιτροπῆς). In an eighth chapter he enumerates the speeches delivered in such actions. Dr. Schulthess has collected carefully the various passages in Greek authors bearing on his subject and discusses fully the opinions held by modern writers on the different questions involved. The material here collected is complete and cannot but prove very useful to scholars, but they will probably prefer in some cases to draw their own conclusions from the information here supplied. In a number of cases I have been unable to follow the reasoning which has led Dr. Schulthess to adopt one rather than another of the conflicting views held by modern scholars; for instance, I cannot but agree with Lipsius in thinking that ἀποκήρυξις was not an Athenian institution (p. 41) and that money belonging to a minor might be lent on ναυτικὸς τόκος as well as on ἑγγειος τόκος (p. 124); Thonissen seems justified in concluding from Lysias vii, 37 that the accuser in such a law-suit was ἀκινδυνος (p. 198. n.); and I am inclined too to believe, with Philippi, that there was a second *εἰσγγελσις* to the *phrateres* (p. 38), of course merely as a religious ceremony (for the civil act took place before the *demotae*), a survival of the ancient Aryan custom (cf. Leist, *Gracco-ital. Rechtsgesch.* p. 68, see also the meaning of *dreihaarig* in old German Law, in *Zeitschr. f. d. Altert.* 1886 p. 352). From C. I. A. ii, 841b it is clear that *κούρειον* and *μεῖον* are not the same, as was generally believed on the strength of the Etym. M.; this fact throws a new light on Poll. viii, 107 φράτορες . . . καὶ εἰς ἡλικίαν προελθόντων ἐν τῇ καλουμένῃ κουρεώτιδι ἡμέρᾳ ὑπὲρ μὲν τῶν ἀρρένων τὸ κούρειον ἔθουον, ὑπὲρ δὲ τῶν θηλειῶν τὴν γαμηλίαν. The latter part of this passage is of course wrong, Pollux himself giving the correct definition of *γαμηλία* in iii, 42, but the first half seems to me to support Philippi's view. This is surely one more instance where Pollux has been proved by later finds to contain correct information; e.g. every one cast doubt on viii, 93 εἰσαγωγεῖς ἀρχῆς κληρωτῆς ὄνομα and 101 οἱ τὰς ἐμμήνους δίκας εἰσάγοντες, until Koehler found their name in an inscription (C. I. A. i No. 37); no one believed in the correctness of viii, 52 ὅτι δὲ εἰσαγγέλῃας καὶ οὐχ ἑλὼν ἀζήμιος ἦν, ἵπερδης ἐν τῷ ὑπὲρ Λυκόφρονος, until the papyrus proved it. To return however to Dr. Schulthess, the reader will probably not find εἰς ἀνδρας τελεῖν (p. 27, n. 2) 'an unintelligible' expression, and may possibly agree with

me that the statement τὸν ἄπαιδα μὴ στρατηγεῖν (42. n). is more likely to have taken its rise from Dinarchus i, 71: καὶ τοὺς μὲν νόμους προλέγειν τῷ ῥήτορι καὶ τῷ στρατηγῷ. . . παιδοποιεῖσθαι κατὰ τοὺς νόμους etc, than in the imagination of the scholiasts. These however are small matters, respecting which difference of opinion may well exist; what seems to me the main fault of the book, and one by which its usefulness cannot but be seriously impaired, is its want of precision and clearness on only too many points. Thus Dr. Schulthess says on p. 199: 'It is evident that the εἰσαγγελία κακώσεως could not but be τιμητή (cf. *Att. Proc.* p. 227, 359)', and in a note to the former reference he remarks: 'Lipsius ought not to mention only the *cisangelia* against arbitrators as τιμητή, for the same was certainly the case with the *cisangelia* for the benefit of orphans.' But this is exactly what Lipsius does say, his words being (on the last line of p. 226); 'die beiden letzten (kinds of εἰσαγγελία scil. κακώσεως and against arbitrators) waren gewiss schlechthin schätzbar.' The note goes on 'Lipsius is likewise wrong (p. 231) in mentioning a γραφή κακώσεως amongst the γραφαὶ τιμηταί, since it is an εἰσαγγελία κακώσεως and there never was a γραφή κακώσεως.' On p. 358 Lipsius observes 'Es ist schwerlich zufällig, dass uns für κάκωσις der Eltern durch ihre Kinder kein Beispiel von Eisangelie überliefert ist. . . es war dann der Weg der Schriftklage einzuschlagen' etc. This Dr. Schulthess declares (p. 206) he cannot understand; 'how' he exclaims, 'should this γραφή be different from the εἰσαγγελία? Probably in this, that the parents on not receiving one-fifth of the votes had to pay a fine of 1,000 drachmae. But how should they think of choosing that action, when the other existed by its side?' Where is the evidence for this latter assertion? The reader will probably think with me that Lipsius, in the absence of all evidence, is perfectly justified in not speaking of an εἰσαγγελία κακώσεως γονέων, especially as he also establishes a difference in the punishment of the offender: those found guilty of κάκωσις γονέων lost their civil rights (p. 360); having thus given his reasons for believing in the existence of a γραφή κακώσεως, he was right in mentioning it on p. 231. It would be easy to multiply instances of such loose reasoning, see p. 74 on the *tutores dativi*, p. 223 on the private arbitrators, etc. Of course Dr. Schulthess knows that Demosthenes had only a sister, and that Demon was his father's brother; he says on p. 54: am nächsten wäre dem Vater Demosthenes sein Bruder Demon gestanden, but on the previous page, probably set wrong by τῷ μὲν—τῷ δέ in Dem. xxvii, 4 he speaks of Demophon as a son of Demon who had married the sister of the elder Demosthenes, and of Aphobus as the son of a brother of the elder Demosthenes; and on p. 77 we find: Demosthenes und seine Geschwister. Or is Geschwister a provincialism for Schwester? there are several such in the book, on p. 6 n. 2 erhältlich, p. 145 im Tun sein, p. 151 Zinsen erzeugen, p. 184 Rechnung stellen, p. 188 die Pflicht der Vormundschaft überbinden etc; at any rate the expression is misleading. The book is not free from confusing misprints, such as ὑπερβολῆς for ὑποβολῆς (p. 100, n.), Gatten for Garten (p. 119, n. 1).

HERMAN HAGER.

Le Droit public Romain, par Th. MOMMSEN; traduit sur la 2me édition allemande, par P. F. GIRARD. Vol. I. Paris. Thorin. 10 fr.

THIS is the first instalment of a translation of the whole of MommSEN and Marquardt's 'Handbuch,' undertaken by eminent French *savants* under the direction of M. G. Humbert. It contains the first

350 pages of the first volume of the second edition of the *Staatsrecht*, which, when the translation is completed, will fill no less than five volumes. The director has wisely entrusted the whole of Mommsen's part of the work to a single hand, and M. Girard has fulfilled his task admirably. Though the powerful rough-hewn German of the original naturally loses much by translation, and though the French language is not seen at its best when trying to cope with Mommsen's weighty sentences, the work is probably as well done as it could be, and the translator has had the invaluable help of the author during the greater part of his labour. This gives the volume a value far beyond that of an ordinary translation, and it may be regarded almost in the light of a third edition. No pains have been spared to bring it up to the level of the latest researches and discoveries; and especially the material embodied in the *ephemeris epigraphica*, and Mommsen's own contributions to the subject since the appearance of the 2nd edition, (1876) have been woven into the notes. It may be useful to set down here some of the chief additions; viz. p. 32, the bearing of the Romulus-Remus legend on the principle of 'Collegialität,' from *Hermes*, vol. 16; p. 132, on the *jurisdictio* of the augurs, from *Eph. Ep.* iii. 101; p. 192 foll., on the nature of the State's right of property, from the *Zeitschrift der Savigny Stiftung*, 1885, p. 207, on magisterial fines, from *Eph. Ep.* ii. 205 (C. I. L. ix. 782); pp. 269, 271, on State contracts, from the *Zeitschrift*, as quoted above; p. 340, on the *præfecti fabrum*, from *Eph. Ep.* iv. 538, v. 31; p. 344, on *salaria*, from Diocletian onwards, from *Eph. Ep.* v. 643, &c.; p. 347, on *consilium* in *jus privatum*, from *Hermes*, 1885; p. 328, on *scribæ*, from *Eph. Ep.* iii. 108; and p. 329, on *locatio operarum*, from the *Savigny-Zeitschrift*, 1885.

M. Humbert is to be congratulated on this excellent beginning of a great undertaking, which will be of the greatest value not only to French students, but also to Englishmen whose German does not go far enough to cope easily with the original. Paper and print are both superior to those of the German editions; the only misprints I have found are in references to the pages of the *Ephem. Epigr.*, which have been corrected in the foregoing paragraph.

W. W. FOWLER.

Studies in the Literary Records of England and Germany in the Sixteenth Century, by CHARLES H. HERFORD, M.A., of Trinity College, Cambridge, late Berkeley Fellow of the Owens College, Manchester. Cambridge: University Press. 1886. Pp. v.—xxix.; 426. 9s.

HERE is a well-written book shewing signs of industrious work in what have been obscure parts of English literature. It would have pleased 'ingenuous Home.' I can fancy Lamb opening it in some of the chapters and becoming engrossed therein: forgiving the occasional occurrence of a German name, till he turns over to a chapter about Germany, and in his dislike to making one in a party of 'Dutchmen,' packs it off to Coleridge.

But in the *Classical Review* we have nothing to do with Owlsglass or Dr. Faustus, Friar Rush or Friar Bacon, Luther's hymns or the Trial and Funeral of the Mass. But the rise of the Latin Drama in Germany and England has its interest for the educationalist, and particularly for the classical scholar. In the quaint attempts to moralize Terence we have a testimony to the popularity of Latin literature, as

well as an evidence of the conscientious views and purposes of the age of the Reformation. Mr. Herford shows how as the sixteenth century went on, Seneca became a greater power in Germany, and secular subjects with a tragic treatment came to preponderate over the comedy with a religious motive.

In the annals of Cambridge we trace this less distinctly, partly because so many of the plays which were acted have been lost—even to their very titles, so that it is hard now to realize how large a share the drama had in Elizabethan education: less hard however since the recent elaboration of Greek tragedy. In Trinity College the statutes (1559—60) required of the prelectors the performance of several tragedies and comedies at Christmas. A comedy had been acted there (in the days of Michael-House) in 1386. The *Mundus plumbens* and the *Microcosmus* of T. Artour, fellow of St. John's, are placed by Mr. Herford between 1520 and 1532. The year 1520 was signalized by the first performance of a play of Plautus, probably of any, non-miracle, Latin play at the English Court, and in 1536 the *Plutus* of Aristophanes was performed with the 'reformed' Greek pronunciation at St. John's. In 1545 the subject of pronunciation was dragged-in at the end of an angry letter from the Chancellor (Bp. Gardiner) to M. Parker then Vice-Chancellor, in which he complains, perhaps on the information of Cuthbert Scot (Bp. of Chester, 1556) of the performance in Lent at Christ's College of an expurgated version of Kirchmayer's *Pam-machius*, a comedy about which Mr. Herford has a good deal to tell us. In 1548 there is a play at Queens', and the companies of Protector Somerset and of the King are allowed to perform in King's College hall. In 1556 the 'Lord' of Christ's performs at Christmas. On a Sunday in May 1557, my Lord of Norfolk's players perform in the hall. On the evening of Sunday, August 6, 1564, we have the *Aulularia* of Plautus in King's College chapel before Queen Elizabeth, who was present at other performances in the same place, *Dido* (a school-drama in Latin hexameters, with no chorus, by J. Ritwyse, master of Paul's, and performed in earlier days by his 'children' before Wolsey), and N. Udall's *Ezechias* in English. A Latin version of the *Ajac flagellifer* of Sophocles had been prepared, but the Queen was too weary to hear it. In 1566, J. Still's *Gammer Gurtons' Needle* was acted at Christ's College, and in 1567—9 there were plays in Jesus' College chapel. A stage was erected in Peterhouse for the comedy in 1571—2. In 1575 interludes and shows were forbidden. Another comedy at Jesus College at Christmas 1577, this time in the hall. About this time Sir J. Harington was at Cambridge, where 'the wyser sort did (and still doe, 1592) mayntayn' comedies and tragedies. In 1580 the Vice-Chancellor declines, on account of the plague, to accept Burleigh's offer to send the Earl of Oxford's players. In 1586 J. Smith (Chr.), founder of the General Baptists, preached in the University Church against the custom of acting plays on Saturday and Sunday evenings. He was called to order by A. Perne (Pet.) deputy V.C. In 1586—7, *Richard III.*, by Legge, was performed at Trinity. In 1590, W. Alabaster's tragedy *Boana*, and *Pedantius*, a Latin broad farce (ascribed to either Mat. Wingfield or Beard) also at Trinity. *Leila* at Queens' (again, according to Cooper, in 1596). In 1592 the University had a struggle with various companies of players, but the Queen gave notice for the students to prepare an English play. John Still (author of *Gammer Gurtons' Needle*) as Vice-Chancellor begged for time, and to substitute *Latin*. In 1595 two comedies and a tragedy at Trinity; and a comedy at

King's. In 1596—7, *Hispanus*, and *Silvanus* a Latin comedy.

In 1597, D. Wilburne's *Machiavellus*, the author a Johnian. *Club Law*, an English comedy, in ridicule of the townsmen (? by G. Ruggle), at Clare. In 1600, a Corpus B.A. was suspended for taking part in an interlude at the Black Bear. And so we come to the *Pilgrimage to Parnassus* and the two parts of the *Return from Parnassus*, three comedies performed in St. John's College, Cambridge, 1597—1601 (very recently edited by Mr. Maeray for the Clarendon Press), and to the confines of the Jacobean (*Ignoramus*) era, which does not fall within the limits of Mr. Herford's interesting and valuable work.

CHR. WORDSWORTH.

Les études classiques avant la Révolution par l'Abbé AUGUSTIN SICARD, vicaire de Saint-Philippe-du-Roule. Paris, libr. acad. Didier; Perrin & Cie, 1887. pp. ix. 590. 3 fr. 50.

THE Abbé Sicard, who has written another work on Education before and after the Revolution, has in the pages now under our notice given a sketch which we may commend both to those who have taken interest in the more serious issues of the *Battle of the Books*, and to those who may still be engaged in prosecuting or in pacifying the struggle in which Ancient is yet contending with Modern in the British Isles. As long ago as 1704 the Jesuits acting *Joseph vendu* before royalty, introduced Apollo in the prologue as mediating between the Genius of Latin and the Genius of French, and counselling them to be good neighbours.

The volume before me contains thirty chapters, whereof about one dozen relate directly to the fortunes of Latin and Greek as employed in education. The other chapters tell of the study of modern languages, history, geography, mathematics, utilitarian (or applied) sciences; of the cultivation of the memory and the judgement; of object-lessons, gymnastics and accomplishments.

In the latter portion of the book the author introduces us to the *systems* of the University of Paris, of the Jesuits, of the 'secular' colleges (of which nearly 400 grew up under episcopal supervision after the Suppression) of the Oratoire, and of the Military Schools established in Paris, and by the Benedictines. The last-named order at least before 1764 had established a '*modern side*' for those pupils who were specially destined *au service*. Here and there M. Sicard inserts a programme (e.g. p. 452, of the Benedictines at Sorèze in 1775, where, by the way, they were so audacious as to abolish verse composition). Also, after the concluding chapters which relate to the state of education in 1789, he gives in an appendix the lists of authors read according to the four great systems. The author writes in a good-humoured style, and shows how the Church of France after the Renaissance was not so far behind-hand in the performance of her duty towards secondary—or even primary—education as some have reported.

I append a list of classical authors which I have extracted and combined from the four programmes to which I have alluded, namely, the course of study of the Jesuits (marked '*J*'), Oratoire ('*O*'), Port-Royalists ('*R*') and University of Paris ('*U*') before the Revolution.

I. Authors included in the *four* schemes: Caesar, Cicero (Letters and other works), Q. Curtius, Horace, Nepos, Ovid, Phaedrus, Sallust, Vergil; Aesop, Demosthenes, Homer, Isokrates, Lucian and Plutarch, *J.O.R.U.*

II. Books which occur in three out of four programmes: Chrysostom, *J.O.U.*; Livy, *J.R.U.*; Justin and Juvenal, *O.R.U.*; Quintilian, *J.R.U.**

III. Books included in one or two of the four schemes: *Epistolae et Evangelia de tempore*, &c., *U.*; Aldus Manutius, *O.*; Aphthonius (Latin), *O.* From this author was derived the system of '*chrics*' (developed common-places, which were much used cir. 1620. See *χρεια* i. 4 in L. and S. Lexicon); Augustae Historiae Scriptores, *O.*; Aurelius Victor, *U.*; Catonis disticha, *O.*; Catullus, *J.*; Comenii Janua Linguarum, *O.*; Corderius, *O.*; Erasmus, *O.*; Eutropius, *R.*; Florus, *O.R.*; Jerome, *U.*; Laberii mini, *R.*; Lactantius, *U.*; Lipsii Monita Politica, *O.*; Martial, *O.*; Vell. Patereculus, *O.U.*; Persius, *O.U.*; Pliny (N.H.) *R.*; Pliny (Paneg.), *R.*; Pontanus, *O.*; Propertius, *J.*; Salvianus, *U.*; Seneca (Trag.) *O.*; Seneca (Philos.), *R.*; Statius, *O.*; Suetonius, *R.*; Tacitus, *R.U.*; Terence, *O.R.*; Tibullus, *J.O.*; Valerius Max., *O.*; Verini '*Vivere diverso*,' *O.*

S. Lucae Evang., *R.U.*; Act. Apostt., *O.*; Aelian, *R.*; Aeschines, *O.*; Aristotle (Rhet.), *R.U.**; Basil, *J.U.*; Cebetis tabula, *J.*; Cyprian, *U.*; Diodorus Siculus, *O.*; Dionys. Halicarn., *U.**; Euripides, *O.R.*; Gregor. Nazian, *J.U.*; Herodian, *R.* (tr. Politian); Herodotus, *R.U.*; Hesiod, *J.O.*; Longinus, *U.**; Pindar, *J.O.*; Phokylides, *J.*; Plato, *J.*; Sophokles, *O.R.*; Synesius, *J.*; Theognis, *J.O.*; Theokritos, *O.*; Thukydides, *J.R.*; Xenophon, *O.R.*

Some of these authors were read only in books of Selections, and all of course were expurgated where necessary. Aristophanes and Plautus seem to have been entirely proscribed. Was Aeschylus considered too difficult? The absence of all the works of the once dominant Aristotle (the Rhetoric excepted) is most interesting to notice.

That system of reading the classics which is connected in England with the name of Mr. Bohn was encouraged by the Port-Royalists in the seventeenth century. The Military Colleges about 1750 stereotyped the use of interlinear versions which Locke and others had recommended in a previous age.

CHR. WORDSWORTH.

Briefwechsel des Beatus Rhenanus. Gesammelt und herausgegeben von DR. ADALBERT HORAWITZ und DR. KARL HARTEFELDER. Leipzig. (Teubner.) 1886. 8°. 28 Mk.

THE correspondence embraces the years 1506 (24 September) to 1546 (12 October). Most of the letters (which are all in Latin) appear here for the first time, but the volume includes also the Dedicatory Epistles written by Rhenanus for various works published during his time. Among the writers and those to whom Rhenanus wrote we find: Joh. Reuchlin, Joh. Oecolampadius, Konrad Peutinger, Willibald Pirckheimer, Desiderius Erasmus, Bonifacius Amerbach, Martin Bucer, Ulrich Zwingli, Ulrich von Hutten, Johannes Aventinus, Wolfgang Lazius, Joh. Oporinus, Sebastian Brant, Joh. à Lasco, &c., &c. The editors have also collected Rhenanus' poems: the epitaphs and inscriptions written by him at various times on various persons and events, and also the epigrams and verses written on him by various scholars. For the history, biography, bibliography, &c. of the period the volume is invaluable, and its value is increased by the editors' short but appropriate notes.—J. H.

* The books marked with an asterisk were recommended to the *masters* at Paris, along with the Psalter 'the unrivalled manual of rhetoric.'

Dom Thierry Ruinart (1657—1709). Notice suivie de Documents Inédits sur sa Famille, sa Vie, ses Œuvres, ses Relations avec D. Mabillon, par HENRI JADART, Secrétaire Général de l'Académie de Reims. Paris, H. Champion. Reims, F. Michaud, 1886. 8vo. pp. viii 190, with engraving of the church of Hautvilliers, with Ruinart's tomb. 5 fr.

THE author is at home in his subject, having published *D. Jean Mabillon. Etude suivie de Documents Inédits sur sa Vie, ses Œuvres, sa Mémoire* (Reims, 1879), and three other works on Mabillon, and also *L'Abbaye d'Hautvilliers (Marne), ses Sépultures, la Tombe de D. Ruinart* (Caen, 1886). He hopes that the entire correspondence of his illustrious townsman may be given to the world; sixty letters written by, or

relating to, Ruinart or his teacher Mabillon, are here printed for the first time. Few literary friendships have been so close or so fruitful in results as that of the great and self-denying scholar, and the pupil who survived his loss but two years, after labouring with redoubled effort to leave none of their joint publications unfinished. Well may M. Jadart hold them up for imitation to their Church at this day (p. 10):—

'Il nous semble que l'on ne peut trop louer cette noble et franche piété, vraie fille de l'Evangile, au contact de laquelle notre siècle devait se retremper. Aussi, dans les ouvrages de D. Ruinart, pas plus que dans sa conduite, on ne rencontre ni manifestation bruyante, ni crédulité puérile, ni déti hautain à ses adversaires.'

J. E. B. M.

EXPERIMENTS IN ARCHAIC METRE.

1. Θρηνώδια.

(Ἀχιλλεὺς πρὸς Πάτροκλον.)

Χαῖρ', ὦ Δαναοῖσιν ἅπασι
τετιμένε κὰν Ἀΐδαο·
πάντες δ', ἄνα, θρηνέουσι
μάλ' οἰκτρὰ σέ, τὸν ποθεινόν.
ἦ γὰρ φάος ἦσθα φίλοισι·
πρώην δ' ὅς ἔλαμπες ἀστήρ
ῥοῖος, ἔθ' Ἑσπερος ἔμπης
λάμπεις σὺ γε κὰν φθιμένοισι.
σοὶ δάκρυα δυσδάκρυτα

δωρούμεθ', ὁμῇ δὲ καλύψει
νῶϊν σορὸς ὅστέα, τέκνον.

2. Κερκίς.

Κερκίς ἔθ' ὦ κερκίς ἐμή,
ἔρδ', ὦ μάλα ποικιλόμητι,
κερκίς τρέχε, δῶρον Αθήνης,
κεδναῖσι μέλημα γυναιξιά.
αἰσέ μοι, αἰγείριοι
φύλλοις ἐκέλη στροβέονσα.

G. C. WARR.

NOTES.

TWO NOTES ON JULIUS CAESAR.

I. THE BRIDGE OVER THE RHINE.—Much the fullest discussion of the structure of this bridge that I have seen in the numerous English editions of Caesar that have lately appeared is given in Mr. Peskett's notes. By the aid of these and the accompanying illustrations we can follow Caesar's account without difficulty so far as the erection of two pairs of piles, sloping in opposite directions: and it seems probable that the two piles of each pair were connected by a cross-piece (Fig. i. c) which may be alluded to by the word *junctura*. But in the interpretation of the next sentence I venture to think that Mr. Peskett has chosen wrongly to follow the majority of commentators, and that only some translation similar to that given by Napoleon III. in his *Jules César* (bk. iii. cap. 7. § 3) can satisfy all requirements.

The passage is as follows (*B. G.* iv. 17).

'Haec utraque insuper bipedalibus trabibus immissis, quantum eorum tignorum junctura distabat, binis utrimque fibulis ab extrema parte distinebantur: quibus disclusis atque in contrariam partem revinctis tanta erat operis firmitudo atque ea rerum natura, ut quo maior vis aquae se incitavisset, hoc artius illigata tenerentur.'

The usual interpretation can easily be gathered from Mr. Peskett's notes: '*haec utraque*' is understood to mean 'in each case the two piles,' and the *fibulae* are arranged variously, but always as connecting two

neighbouring piles: and the words '*quibus disclusis*, etc.' are taken to refer to the *fibulae*, but are not exactly explained. But this totally fails to show how the security of the bridge was attained: on the contrary, the linking of the two adjoining piles only would leave the whole structure most unsteady. Caesar obviously speaks with some pride of an ingenious device to avoid this.

Napoleon's note is: 'It has not been hitherto observed that the words '*haec utraque*' relate to the two couples of one row of piles, and not to the two piles of one couple. Moreover the words '*quibus disclusis*, etc.' relate to these same two couples, and not, as has been supposed, to the *fibulae*.'

He gives a diagram in illustration, which is reproduced by Mr. Peskett, and which, as will be seen, represents a real addition to the strength and compactness of the bridge. It may further be noticed that the word '*distinebantur*' shows that the main object of the *fibulae* was to prevent the couples of piles from falling together inwards: and this end would most simply be attained by notching the *fibulae* or by letting them in to the beams at each end. The sentence will run more smoothly if we take the single word *quibus* to be *abl. instr.* and to refer to the *fibulae*: 'and the two couples of piles were kept open by these.' I do not feel quite satisfied with taking '*in contrariam partem revinctis*' to mean 'they were linked from one end of the bridge to the other:' may it not be 'they were linked together

crosswise,' that is, the right-hand upper pile to the left-hand lower pile, and *vice versâ*? This would avoid the difficulty of the two *fibulae* crossing half-way, so obvious in Napoleon's diagram.

If the *fibulae* were let into holes in the beams at each end, the force of the current, being somewhat greater upon the upper piles, and being counteracted at the lower piles by the special supports, would really be to force the upper piles against the *fibulae*, and the lower ends of the *fibulae* deeper into the lower piles: and thus, *prima facie* at least, to make the whole structure more compact. My attention has however been called to the fact that the bridge would still lack joints connecting the couples in the direction across the stream.

I propose therefore to translate the whole sentence as follows: 'connecting the two pairs of piles were laid beams of two feet width, that being the breadth of the joint between the two piles of each pair. The two pairs of piles were kept at their proper distance by two braces at their extremities on each side: and as these braces not only held them thus open, but also connected them cross-wise, the whole work was exceedingly firm, and by the effect of natural laws, the greater the stream of water that bore upon the whole, the more compact became its structure.'

II. CAESAR'S SPEECH IN BEHALF OF THE CATILINARIANS.—It seems to be generally supposed that Caesar, when pleading for a lighter penalty than that of death in the case of Lentulus and his associates, made a deliberate attack upon the state religion, and denied the accepted dogma of future punishments. Mr. Froude, in particular, in his 'Sketch' emphasizes this point. But if Caesar, appearing as *pontifex maximus* and praetor elect, and in a trial in which not only the life of other Roman citizens but his own also was threatened, gave his opponents any such advantage, we shall certainly have cause to wonder at his audacity rather than at his discretion. But this view is perhaps a little exaggerated.

It will be well in the first instance to quote the words of Sallust (Cat. 51. 20) 'De poena possum equidem dicere, id quod res habet, in luctu atque miseriis mortem aerumnarum requiem, non cruciatum esse; eam cuncta mortalium mala dissolvere, ultra neque curae neque gaudio locum esse.' With the exception of the last clause, there is no reference to a future state of rewards or punishment: a question quite distinct is proposed, whether death in itself is a good or an evil.

The reference in Cicero's speech (Cat. iv. 7) is more explicit. 'Alter (C. Caesar) intelligit mortem a dis immortalibus non esse supplicii causa constitutam, sed aut necessitatem naturae aut laborum ac miseriarum quietem esse: itaque eam sapientes nunquam inviti, fortes etiam saepe libenter oppetiverunt.' This is a better argument for us to follow than Sallust's statement, which may very well be taken from it: and Caesar's meaning clearly is that death is in itself a blessing. It is possible he may have hinted his disbelief in any life beyond: Cicero in his reply certainly urges that the old Romans had determined there must be some kind of punishment in the world below like those which Caesar is proposing for Catiline and his associates now: or else ill-doers would have no reason to dread death. But even if Cicero bases his counter-argument on a religious dogma, it does not follow that Caesar had gone out of his way to attack it.

That the question whether death in itself is an evil was a *κοινὸς τόπος* of the schools, appears from Juvenal x. 357-9,

'fortem posce animum, mortis terrore carentem,
qui spatium vitae extremum inter munera ponat
naturae.'

and abundant illustration is given in Prof. Mayor's¹ note on this passage. But it is characteristic of Roman forensic oratory that so abstract a discussion should form a prominent feature in an exciting political debate: and if Caesar compromised himself in any way during its course, it was probably because he imagined himself for the moment with his old teacher at Rhodes, and in the enjoyment of the full freedom of academic debate. That any disrespect was intended to the religion of his ancestors is most unlikely: for that Caesar was quite as ready as Cicero himself to support as a statesman, though it might have but little influence on his speculative views.

E. V. ARNOLD.

THE EPITHET GIVEN TO PROCHYTA BY VERGIL IN AEN. IX. 715.—At the beginning of the seventh volume (1849) of *The Classical Museum*, there is an article 'On Critical Induction,' by 'C. B.' It contains (p. 4) the following:—

'Tum sonitu Prochyta alta tremit, durumque cubile
Inarime Jovis imperiis imposta Typhoco.'

Whatever may be the exact height of Prochyta, the epithet *alta* is absurd when mention is made in the same sentence of Inarime (*Ischia*), which is close by it, and one of the highest mountains in the country. All that can be said is that *alta* is a kind of hack epithet with Vergil, and especially with the elision, as here used.'

The writer then quotes the following passages:—*Aen.* ix. 678; *Georg.* ii. 479; *Aen.* x. 197: i. 189; iv. 343; vi. 179; ix. 388; *Georg.* iii. 393; *Aen.* vi. 788; i. 427, 429; xii. 929; ii. 448; xii. 546, 547, 474. In none of these passages do I see any ground for finding fault with the epithet *alta*, nor do I think that the elision affects the epithet at all.

Forbiger refers to his note on *Aen.* iii. 76. He there says:—

'Verissime docet Wagner insulas (utpote quae omnes mari emineant) poetis promiscue altas dici, ut ab ipso Virgilio, ix. 715, Prochyta, quae humilis fuerit.'

Conington says:—

'Prochyta may be called *alta* as a rocky island, or *alta* may go with *tremit*, which seems more likely.'

I would rather account for the epithet thus:—Vergil had I think in his eye that lofty rock in the north-east of Procida (*Prochyta*), on which is now the Castello. In a foreshortened view of the island from the mainland, such as was familiar to Vergil, it would be the prominent object, and would seem quite to justify the epithet *alta*.—J. HOSKYNs ABRAHAM.

Immunis aram si tetigit manus
Non sumptuosā blandior hostiā,
Mollivit aversos penates
Farre pio et saliente mica.

THIS clear passage has been darkened by the multitude of commentators. Remove the comma after *manus* and place it after *hostia*. *Immunis* is as elsewhere in Horace 'without a gift' and emphatic. Construe:

'If without a gift thy hand has touched the altar not (seeking to become) more coaxing by (the sacrifice of) a costly victim, then it has appeased the angry Penates with the simple *mola salsa*.'

The force of the comparative *blandior* is thus exactly given; the suppliant approaches the altar without a gift, not endeavouring to *add* to her powers of persuasion by a costly sacrifice, and *blandus* is used with some scorn (cf. *blandiri*), Horace distinctly

¹ Prof. Mayor now takes *extremum* as predicate, in edition of 1886, vol. I. p. 466.

deprecating such endeavours to 'wheel' the gods into showing favour, cf. his scornful use of *pacisci* 'to bargain'—*volis pacisci, ne Cypriac Tyriaeque merces* &c.

The stanza probably represents a well known γνῶμη, cf. Pliny *Præf. N. H.* *mola tantum salsa liliant qui non habent tura*. The *mola salsa* is not reckoned as a 'gift' but represents the spirit of sacrifice and avails without any costly sacrifice.—T. E. P.

EMENDATION OF LIVY XLII. 17, AND OF APPIAN, *Maced.* XI. 7, 8.—When the Romans were hunting up pretexts for the third Macedonian war, it was asserted, among other things, that Perseus had bribed a wealthy citizen of Brundisium to poison certain leading Romans and envoys as they passed through that town on their way to and from the East, or (as Appian says) to poison the senate. This citizen had been selected by Perseus owing to the special facilities he enjoyed for perpetrating the crime. *Princeps Brundisii Rammius fuit: hospitio quoque et duces Romanos omnes et legatos exterarum quoque gentium insignes, præcipue regios, accipiebat*.

Summoned to Perseus' court, Rammius, in terror of being himself a victim, promised to carry out the plot, but instead of returning home hastened to C. Valerius, at that time at Chalcis, who sent him on to Rome. There he laid his information before the senate.

The name of this Brundisian is given by Livy as L. Rammius, by Appian as Herennios. The latter is more probable, as the name Rammius seems not to occur elsewhere, though Remmius, Rennis, Ramnius, and other similar names appear on inscriptions and coins. But an inscription discovered by Carapanos at Dodona in 1876 (Cauer², No. 247; Collitz, *Samm-lung*, vol. ii. heft 1), and discussed among others by Fick, *Bezenberger's Beiträge*, iii. p. 269; Bursian, *Sitzungsberichte d. Bayer. Königl. Acad.* 1878, ii. p. 15, and by Mr. Roberts, *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, ii. p. 113, seems to throw doubt upon either name being the correct form. That inscription contains a grant by the Epirotes of *proxenia*, and other privileges, to one Gaios Dazoupos Rennis, of Brundisium, on the ground of the 'goodwill which he continues to bear towards the Epirotes.'

Fick assigned this inscription to later than 244 B.C. when Brundisium became a Roman colony, since Rennis had three names after the Roman fashion. By the reference in the decree to Antinous as strategos of the Epirotes, compared with Polybius xxvii. 13, 7, xxx. 7, 2, and Livy xlv. 26, Bursian fixed the date more closely as about 170 B.C. Now as Rammius was in Macedonia in 172, is it unreasonable to suppose that he had visited his friends in Epirus too, and was honoured by this decree in his favour? It is extremely improbable that there should be two persons living in Brundisium at the same time, with names so similar, and both distinguished for hospitality to foreigners; there need, therefore, be no hesitation in replacing the Rammius of Livy, the Herennios of Appian by the Gaios Dazoupos Rennis of the Dodonaean Inscription.—P. GILES.

THE ASFRAGALIZONTES OF POLYCLETUS.—In the excursus upon the Social Games of Rome, in *Gallus*, Becker mentions the Greek game of ἀρτιασμός, 'odd and even,' known at Rome as *par impar*, and after describing it, adds 'The *Asfragalizontes* of Polycletus may however have been real dice-players.' Certainly 'may have been,' but from the comparison of a passage in Apoll. Rhod. and from general considerations it seems much more probable that it represented boys playing at ἀρτιασμός.

From the words of Pliny (*N. H.* xxxiv. § 19) we only

gather that this famous work represented boys playing with ἀσπράγαλοι (knucklebones), and we know that besides the use of knucklebones (or imitation ones) as dice, called by Becker (*Charicles* p. 354) 'the regular game,' and the game of ἀρτιασμός, there were other games played with ἀσπράγαλοι, as for instance πεντάλιθα. The passage I refer to is *Ap. Rh.* iii. 117 foll.: where Eros and Ganymede are playing together.

ἀμφ' ἀσπράγαλοισι δὲ τῶγε
χρυσείοις, ἅτε κούροι δμήθεες, ἐψιδῶντο.
καὶ ῥ' ὁ μὲν ἤδη πᾶμπαν ἐνίπλεον ᾧ ὑπὸ μαζᾷ
μάργος Ἔρως λαιῆς ὑπὸσχανε χεῖρὸς ἀγοστόν,
ὀρθὸς ἐφεστηώς . . . ὁ δ' ἐγγύθεν ὀκλαδὸν ἦστο
σίγα κατηφιδὼν· δοῖω δ' ἔχεν, ἄλλον ἔτ' αὐτως
ἄλλω ἐπιπροΐεις· κεχόλωτο δὲ καγχαλόωντι,
καὶ μὴν τούσγε παράσσον ἐπὶ προτέρουσιν ὀλέσσας
κ.τ.λ.

There are three points in which the game here described resembles ἀρτιασμός. (1) It was especially a child's game. See Becker's *Charicles*, p. 354, where he alludes to antiques representing children at this game, and wherever it is mentioned it is mostly spoken of as played by children or by men who make themselves children, see *Plat. Lysis* 206 E.; *Ar. Rhet.* iii. 5. 4 (where Cope shortly describes the game in his note); *Lucian. Dial. Deor.* IV.; so with *par impar*, see *Hor. Sat.* ii. 3. 248; *Suet. Aug.* 71. Eros is always represented as preeminently childish in appearance and habits, to make the more piquant his mischievous disposition and enormous power for evil. (2) The game in Apollonius is played not only with golden knucklebones but for them, because Ganymede loses all he has. (3) The attitude of Eros is just what might be expected. He holds his hands upon his breast, asking Ganymede to guess, and Becker himself in the passage from *Gallus* quoted says in allusion to ἀρτιασμός, 'it is represented in works of art, as for instance where a boy is pressing the hand containing his gains to his breast.' I may add that Beeq de Fouquières in his *Jeux des Anciens* (pp. 284–289) refers at some length to this passage of Apollonius and takes it for granted that ἀρτιασμός is here represented. The only difficulty is the word ἐπιπροΐεις 'throwing forward,' which would naturally refer to dice. But may it not mean merely 'staking,' as Beeq de Fouquières translates 'il n'avait plus que deux osselets qu'il aventurait l'un après l'autre'? However it is clear from *c.g.* *Plat. Alc.* 2 and from engravings of ancient frescoes given by Beeq de Fouquières on pp. 332, 333 that boys played games with ἀσπράγαλοι in which they threw them forward as dice are thrown. Still this by no means outweighs the reasons above given for thinking ἀρτιασμός is represented in Apoll. Rhod., and, assuming that, is it rash to suppose that Apollonius has in mind the very statue of Polycletus referred to by Pliny, for most people will agree that he is representing some work of art—painting or sculpture? At all events I think it will be admitted that the game of 'odd and even' suits the conditions of the statue of Polycletus, if not better than any other game with ἀσπράγαλοι, certainly far better than the game with dice.

R. C. SEATON.

ANNOUNCEMENTS.—Editions of Polybius and of Apollonius Rhodius are in preparation, the former by Mr. J. L. Strachan Davidson of Balliol College, the latter by Mr. R. C. Seaton, late Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge. A series of parallel grammars will shortly be commenced under the supervision of Mr. E. A. Sonnenschein, professor of Greek and Latin at Mason College, Birmingham, who will himself contribute the Latin grammar. It is hoped by the

employment of a uniform terminology to avoid the confusion now arising from the use of different terms to express the same or corresponding facts in different languages.

Mr. Teubner announces in his *Mitteilungen* for 1887 (1) A *Corpus glossariorum Latinorum*, edited by G. Goetz who acknowledges his obligations to G. Löwe, Gundermann, and other scholars. The first volume will contain a history of Latin glossography; the second, which is already in type, contains Philo-

xenus and the pseudo-Cyril. There will probably be nine volumes in all; (2) *Pergamos* by E. Thraemer, an inquiry into the early history and legends of the western side of Asia Minor; (3) an unpublished treatise of Plutarch on the Proverbs of Alexandria, edited by O. Crusius; (4) a new edition of K. F. Hermann's Plato, by Th. Wohlrab, with an accompanying volume on the 147 MSS. of Plato. As regards the mutual relations of the MSS., Wohlrab is in substantial agreement with Schanz.

UNIVERSITY INTELLIGENCE.

OXFORD.

Congregation has accepted the preambles of two statutes, the first affirming the principle that a School of Modern Language and Literature should be started; the second leading to some change in the practice of the Bodleian curators with regard to lending books. The Modern Language and Literature proposal gets into committee first, and there are two classes of amendments—one aiming at the insertion of various less known—especially Slavonic—languages, the other attempting to secure the recognition of literature; as the present proposals throw the whole management of the School into the hands of the philologists. It is a tribute to the humanising influence of Latin and Greek studies, that the Professors of those languages are the champions whom the advocates of culture wish to place on the board. Meanwhile something better is to be done. The Merton Professorship is to be limited to language, as it practically was already; and the Chair of Poetry is to be widened into a Chair of English Literature. But all these projects are only in their first stage, and the term will only just suffice to settle them. The only thing certain is that the philologists will have it all their own way, unless the less constant attendants come down and vote. The Bodleian

question is likely to be fiercely contested: but the preliminary discussion was calming. The 'borrowers' list' was read, and the Librarian gave explanations which tended to prove that very little harm had as yet been done by the assailed officials. At the same time, it seems that readers do sometimes go away because the books they wanted are lent out. The general tendency of the discussion, as well as the obvious feeling of the audience, was in favour of very strict rules: but it was pointed out that some of the collections had been left under condition that they *should* be lent to certain classes of claimants.

Dr. Tylor continues his exposition of the Pitt-Rivers collection. He is dealing at present with the development of armour: and pointed out, amongst other things, that the shield was originally an offensive weapon—a parrying-stick—used defensively, and was gradually modified so as to cover more and more of the person. One curiosity shown was a very good representative of a Greek helmet from the South Sea islands: but it was not impossible the result of early intercourse with Spaniards, and not a home-growth.

The Rev. W. W. Jackson has been elected Rector of Exeter College.

CAMBRIDGE.

Mr. E. A. Gardner (*Caius*) has been elected to the Craven Studentship. This is the first election to the studentship, which was established in 1885 for the encouragement of advanced study or research away from Cambridge. Mr. Gardner is well known for the active part he has taken in the exploration of Naucratis and for other archaeological work in Egypt in conjunction with Mr. Flinders Petrie.

The financial needs of the library are once more

brought up in a report of the Syndicate. Unless research is to be crippled in various departments, £1,000 of additional income must be provided.

By the sudden death of the Hon. I. G. N. Keith-Falconer at Aden the university has lost an Arabic scholar of great promise. He succeeded Mr. Robertson Smith as Lord Almoner's reader in Arabic only last year.

We have received the following from our Dublin correspondent:—

I find that in my May letter I have fallen into an inexcusable mistake. Dr. Edward Hincks was neither an astronomer nor, strictly speaking, a classical archaeologist. He was an Egyptologist and Assyriologist, and one of the greatest discoverers in those

departments of investigation. One correspondent tells me: 'Outside the domain of mathematics the greatest name of this century on the roll of Dublin University is that of Edward Hincks.' Another says: 'No other man ever did so much for any other language as Hincks for Assyrian.'

[For Scholarships see page 183.]

ARCHAEOLOGY.

Historia Numorum: a Manual of Greek Numismatics. By BARCLAY V. HEAD, Assistant-Keeper of the Department of Coins and Medals in the British Museum. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1887.

MR. HEAD'S *Historia Numorum* is the most comprehensive work on numismatic science
NOS. V. & VI. VOL. I.

that has appeared since Eckhel's days. It represents a masterly, if perhaps too heroic, endeavour to compress within the limits of a portly octavo volume a general outline of the almost inexhaustible coinages of the Hellenic world. I have said 'Hellenic,' but the subject is of so vast a nature as to require a notice of whole categories of coins

—Lycian, Indian, Punic, Iberian, and others, the history of which is inseparable from those of more purely Greek fabric. In all this Mr. Head has shrunk from no obstacle of character or language, and the last results of exploration in these special fields will be found duly summarised in his work.

Mr. Head's work is not a series of essays like Lenormant's unfinished *Histoire de la Monnaie dans l'Antiquité*. It does not profess to be a complete and detailed description of every known type like that of Mionnet. Neither does it pretend to be a modern substitute for the *Doctrina Numorum*. The great work of Eckhel will still remain the starting-point of numismatic science. But, as Mr. Head very justly reminds us, that science has undergone an entirely new development since Eckhel's days. Fresh fields of study, of which the author of the *Doctrina* was ignorant, have been opened up. New alphabets and syllabaries have been discovered and deciphered. Hoard after hoard of ancient coins has been brought to light presenting endless new varieties. Wrong attributions, such as those that deprive Elis and Corinth of their coinages, have been set right. Whole classes previously unknown have been recognised and tabulated. Of the electrum staters of Cyzicus, the very existence of which had been doubted by Eckhel, no less than 150 varieties have now been described. More than this, new principles and methods have been introduced into the study of ancient coins by the advance of metrology, epigraphy, and the archaeology of art. The weight, the form of the letters, and the style of the design at present afford criteria as to the date of a coin such as were almost wholly wanting at the beginning of this century.

With the difficult subject of metrology Mr. Head shows himself specially competent to deal. In his interesting and comprehensive introduction the vexed questions connected with the origin and transmission of weight-standards receive fresh and suggestive treatment based on the most recent discoveries and investigations. On the one side stands the Egyptian decimal system with its *kats* and *utens*, upon which Mr. Petrie's researches have shed so much new light. On the other is the Babylonian and Assyrian sexagesimal system, derived apparently from time-measures based on the astronomic science of old Chaldaea. Mr. Head, while acknowledging the possible influence of the Egyptian standard on some early coins of Lycia and Thrace for example, accepts the

claims put forward on behalf of Babylonia and Assyria as the sources of all Greek metric systems. The ancient duck and lion weights of Assyria show us a heavy and light mina for the respective weight of which Brandis' estimate of 1010 and 505 grammes may still be regarded as approximately accurate. Of these the heavier seems to have been more generally in use in Syria, whence it passed to the Phoenicians, who, however, while adopting the heavy *shekel*, its sixtieth part, as their unit of weight, rejected the sexagesimal system in favour of a mina of fifty shekels, only retaining the old system in the talent of sixty minae. The lighter mina, on the other hand, with its lighter shekel seems to have found favour among the Hittites, the natural intermediaries between Assyria and the western parts of Asia Minor. Mr. Head, indeed, advances some good reasons for supposing that the 'mina of Carchemish,' as the light Babylonian standard is described in cuneiform inscriptions, had reached the shores of the Troad at a period long anterior to the first issue of coined money. In the Trojan treasure discovered by Dr. Schliemann were six silver wedges, each apparently representing one-third of the light mina, a fact which it is difficult not to connect with the Hittite association, in which the men of Ilion, the Dardanians and their kin, appear in Egyptian records of the fourteenth century before our era. The 'weight of Carchemish' was adopted by the Lydians, and the bullet-like electrum pieces ascribed to Gyges (c. B.C. 700), the earliest known coins, were thus regulated by the light Assyrian mina. From Lydia this lighter standard passed to Milêtos and other Ionian cities, and so on to Euboea, giving rise in turn to the Euboic system, to which Solon's legislation gave still wider currency as the Attic. On the other hand the heavier Assyrian standard spreading over sea from Phoenicia took root in Aegina and the Peloponnese, where Pheidôn of Argos, though not 'the inventor of money,' may at least be regarded as the author of the earliest coinage of Greece Proper—the archaic 'tortoises' of Aegina.

As a rule, in his geographical arrangement, Mr. Head follows the order generally adopted by numismatists, placing however Lydia and Phrygia immediately after Ionia and Caria. The vast preponderance of the coinage of Imperial date in the inland regions and a certain community of type, notably the frequent representations of the bust of the ΙΕΡΑ CYNKAHTOC personified.

afford good reasons for not breaking up the series pertaining to the senatorial province of Asia by the interpolation of coins from other Anatolian regions. It is a pity, however, that the author has not seen his way to throw over the preposterous and perverse arrangement by which Sybaris, for example, is included in 'Lucania,' or Caulonia in 'Bruttium.' Again, the separation of the coins of the two shores of the Cimmerian Bosphorus is wholly arbitrary, nor can the general practice of numismatists be pleaded against a violation of historic unity. But the arrangement as a whole leaves little to be desired, and Mr. Head has shown himself laudably anxious in fixing the site of ancient mint-towns to incorporate the results of the latest archaeological exploration. In the case of Phrygia he has had the valuable assistance of Professor Ramsay.

Few indeed are the numismatic students who would consider themselves competent to follow Mr. Head over the whole of the vast field that is covered by the present work. Specialists in this or that branch will here and there complain that coins by which they themselves set store have been left out in the cold. But in condensing such a huge mass of facts some omissions were inevitable. The whole is in this case so much greater than the part that it is not without a certain sense of captiousness that I venture to note a few suggestions and rectifications that occur to me on a first perusal of Mr. Head's book. In the case of Italy, as the author himself informs us, he had not the advantage of consulting Garrucci's work, *Le monete dell' Italia Antica*, otherwise he would have found, for instance, a confirmation of his conjecture that the remarkable male figure on the coins of Caulonia supporting on his outstretched arm a running mannikin with winged feet represents not Apollo Katharsios but a local subject. The inscription KOKIN... read by Garrucci over the head of the principal figure now shows conclusively that it is in fact a personification of the Cocinthian promontory who with the aid of Zephyr purges from its malarious exhalations the narrow valley (αἰλὼν) in which the city lay. In his arduous endeavour to reduce to chronological order the complicated and very extensive series of Tarentine coins Mr. Head would have received no assistance from Garrucci's work, which in this respect is confusion worse confounded. The general result at which he arrives is corroborated by some large recent finds of Tarentine coins, but the complete break in the didrachm series which he sup-

poses to have occurred on the Roman conquest of B.C. 272 seems very doubtful, and the interesting type reading TAPANTI-NΩNHMI (Ταπαντίων ἐπι) must on grounds of style be taken from the fourth-century class with which Mr. Head groups it and referred to a date nearer the middle of the preceding century B.C. The silver type of Rubi, presenting on one side the full-faced head of Hēlios, is, as Avellino first pointed out in his essay *De argenteo Rubastino*, an alliance piece struck on the occasion of the Italian expedition of the Molossian Alexander, and is paralleled by types of that prince and the Tarentines. It thus belongs to a small class of coins which has a special chronological value and its date should have been approximately given as 332 B.C., a generation earlier than it appears in the *Manual*. At Heraclea the appearance of the name of the engraver, Aristoxenos, who also worked at Metapontion, should have been noted, and amongst the coins of the Bruttians the small bronze piece having as its obverse type the head of Athēnē with a helmet in the shape of a crab—a type which Lenormant has with great probability brought into relation with the Pallas cult of Skyllētion and its river *Karkinēs*—should hardly have been omitted.

To the few known coins of Hierôn's Aetna enumerated by Mr. Head may be added the type presenting the so-called 'crayfish' (better described as the Mediterranean prawn), on which Holm (*Das Alte Catania*, p. 7) lays stress as an additional link with the Catanese series. The enigmatic ΙΙΒ on the coins of Segesta and Eryx has not yet received its solution. The suggestions that it is the equivalent of the Phoenician 'Tsits,' and that 'Tsits' in turn = ὄρμος or Panormos, seem equally inadmissible. Ugdulena has shown that 'Tsits,' for which he prefers to read 'Tsejets,' for Σέγεστ does not, as De Sauley supposed, occur on Panormitan coins. Nor can ΙΙΒ be fairly regarded as a Greek transliteration of this Phoenician word, since it occurs on coins of Segesta and Eryx in the variant forms ΙΙ, ΙΙΙ, ΙΙΑ, and ΙΙΕ. Eckhel's dictum still holds good: 'hos numeros inter ignotos ablegandos censeo quos aliquando felicius quidam Laii filius evolvat.'

To the Illyrian cities included in the *Manual* as having struck autonomous coins may be added Lissos—Alessio—(*Num. Chron.* 1880, p. 271) and Scupi—Üsküp—(Postolacca—*Synopsis*, &c.).

The early coins which Mr. Head in agreement with Imhoof-Blumer and Von Sallet attributes to Apollonia in Thrace must in all probability be referred to the Tauric Chersonese. The Russian numismatist Chr. Giel has proved almost to demonstration that in fact Pantikapæon itself, like its fellow colony on the western shores of the Euxine, took its original Hellenic name from Apollo, the state patron of its Milesian mother-city. The small fifth-century silver pieces with the legend ΑΠ or ΑΠΟΛ in the incuse square and with the lion's scalp are themselves only distinguishable by their slightly earlier fabric from the pieces of similar design which bear the legend ΠΑΝ or ΠΑΝΤΙ, and are the undoubted product of the Pantikapæan mint. The connexion is however rendered still more intimate by the occurrence of another closely allied class of coin with the legends ΑΠΟ, ΠΑ or ΠΑΝΤΙ, having on the obverse in place of the lion's scalp an ant, *μύρμηξ*, the *type parlant* of Myrmékion, a small town which might almost be regarded as a quarter of Pantikapæon. It is further to be remarked that these coins reading ΑΠ and ΑΠΟΛ are, so far as is at present known, only found at Kertch or in its district. During a short stay in that town, I was indeed so fortunate as to obtain what I cannot but regard as an additional numismatic record of the Tauric Apollonia. Together with one or two of the small Apollonian silver pieces with the lion's scalp I secured, also from the Pantikapæan site, a unique and hitherto unpublished Cyzicene stater of the finest style, on which the Hyperborean Apollo, olive-branch in hand, is seen mounted on his griffin. Lenormant has rightly laid stress on the federal character assumed by so many Cyzicene types. When we find the Sphinx of Chios or the winged boar of Klazomenae, the lion of Milêtos, the half Pegasos of Lampsakos and other national types linked together on these staters with the Cyzicene tunny, we are justified in supposing that 'a number of towns of Asia Minor and the Euxine shores seeing the enormous profits that Cyzicus drew from its monetary operations allied themselves with this town to exploit in common the Hyperborean gold and took shares, so to speak, in the great Cyzicene undertaking.' That Pantikapæon the channel through which the gold-hoards of the Ural reached the Cyzicene speculators should have itself obtained this monetary recognition was only to be expected, and accordingly, though at a

somewhat later date, we find the Pan's head of its coinage represented on Cyzicene staters. In the present instance I venture to see an eloquent allusion to the earlier name of the same city which identified it in a special way with the cult of the Hyperborean Apollo. Amongst the coins of the neighbouring Sindi, Mr. Head has omitted the important type, first described by Oreschuikoff, the reverse of which displays the owl of the Athenian decadrachms, a coin of considerable interest as a landmark of Athenian enterprise in this direction, and as affording a close parallel to the coins of similar type struck by Amisos opposite under its new name of Peiræus.

The language which Mr. Head habitually uses with regard to Greek autonomous coins of the imperial period seems liable to misconstruction. Certainly, in the case of Roman Colonies the right of coinage was due to special privilege on the part of the Emperor or the Governor of the Province. But unless we are to suppose that in every treaty of alliance between Rome and a Free City there was a special clause affecting the issue of coinage—an entirely gratuitous assumption—it must be admitted that in the case of these Free and Allied Cities the full *right* of coinage remained, though it was not always thought politic to make use of it. It was, as is well known, a maxim of Roman law, that such cities or peoples were outside the Roman jurisdiction. But this constitutional aspect has not been sufficiently regarded in the *Manual*. To take the extreme instance of Massalia, which does not seem to have struck coins after its capture by Caesar's legate, there can be little doubt that, had the city considered a resumption of its autonomous coinage compatible with its interests, it could have continued to strike coins. There was an excellent reason for the interruption of its coinage, for the treasury was cleared out by the invaders; but the independence of the Massaliote Commonwealth was not touched. Strabo expressly tells us that in his day Massalia was not subject to the Governor of the Province. The cessation of the Massaliote currency should be rather taken in connexion with the very small denominations of its pre-existing autonomous coinage, and the large use already prevailing of foreign money. The general custom of the West also told against the exercise of its undoubted right of coinage; but had Massalia lain in Asia, we may be very sure that its mint would not have remained inactive. To take another and more con-

spicuous instance, that of Athens. 'It is probable,' Mr. Head tells us, 'that about the time of Hadrian the rare privilege of striking autonomous bronze money was accorded to Athens.' It is possible that after Sulla's capture a break occurs in the autonomous currency. Political expediency may well have dictated such an omission, but the question of right was surely not touched. After Sulla's time, as before, Athens remained a Free City, and if while reviving its bronze coinage it still abstained from striking gold or silver, it never at least condescended, even in the sunniest hours of imperial favour, to place either Caesar's image or his circumscription on its χαλκοί. The constitutional position of many Greek cities as regards the Empire was of such a kind that even when, as is generally the case, we find the effigy of the reigning Emperor on their autonomous coins, its appearance should be rather regarded as a voluntary tribute of respect or adulation than as due to any legal obligation. The general cessation of autonomous coinages, outside Egypt, towards the end of the third century, a cessation which connects itself with the administrative reforms of Aurelian, cannot itself be taken as a proof that the Free Cities abdicated their privilege. A Free City would by the very nature of things be more anxious to gratify the wishes of the Emperor than one of inferior title to bow to his will. Thus at Cherson, to take an eminent example, although the usual break in the coinage seems to occur about the end of the fourth century of our era, the right of coinage was never relinquished. About Justinian's time we find the Tauric City, inspired perhaps by the Western examples of Ravenna and Ticinum, reissuing an autonomous coinage which with the complimentary adjuncts of imperial effigies and monograms continued to the eleventh century.

It is indeed in its treatment of the autonomous coinages belonging to the imperial period that Mr. Head's book leaves most to be desired. Yet from many points of view these coins have a greater value than those of a better artistic period. The aesthetic element which to many is the great attraction of Greek coins has, it is true, largely diminished. But the idealism of the great age brought with it a vagueness of type which in less skilled hands rapidly sank into vapidness. Types are etherealised till every characteristic feature has been improved away, and we know not who stands before us, a nymph or a goddess, a local hero or a pan-Hellenic god, nay, at times, we are even left

in doubt whether the form be human or divine. It is still a moot point, for instance, whether the head on the beautiful drachms of Lamia represents Apollo, as Dr. Friedlaender supposes, or, as Professor Gardner holds, the celebrated courtesan! In contradistinction to this the antiquarian and realistic spirit of the Greco-Roman period is peculiarly valuable. Even regarding them from the point of view of art, it is to the coins of this period alone that we can turn for any accurate representation of many of the masterpieces of ancient sculpture. The Didymean Apollo of Milêtos and the Aphroditê of Knidos, the Leto of Euphranor and Tychê of Eutychides, the Parthenos and Olympic Zeus of Phidias himself are only a few among the great plastic works of antiquity commemorated for us on this later series of autonomous coins. The constitution of individual cities, their geography and commerce, the architecture of their buildings, and the statues in their public places, the portraits of their worthies, the festivals of the citizens, and their special religious cults are illustrated as they were never illustrated before. The necessarily restricted currency of these civic as opposed to imperial issues gave the freest scope to local colouring.

It is evident that Mr. Head does not underrate this important part of his subject. In his comprehensive introduction he has given a useful list of the titles attached to the cities themselves, and to their varied magistracy and priesthood, as well as the names of their games and festivals. Nor has he omitted to give a fuller description of some at least of the more remarkable local types. But he seems to have been deterred by considerations of space from treating of this later period with a measure of fullness at all proportionate to the vast mass of material at his disposal. Thus, although he has evidently exercised great care in his selection of types for 'honourable mention,' the irresistible consequences of undue compression are none the less visible. Important types are omitted or referred to with a brevity incompatible with information. Inscriptions are given without the accompanying type, and types without the inscription. The illustrations of coins of this later period are reduced to a minimum. Yet there are many types of imperial times far more deserving of reproduction than not a few of the earlier coins of which illustrations are given in the book. What indeed could be of more graphic interest than such topographical designs as that for instance

of the Samaritan Neapolis exhibiting Mount Gerizim with its twin temple-crowned summits, or the better known companion piece of Athens that gives us a glimpse of the Akropolis and its buildings? What more interesting coin can be conceived than that of Pautalia, on which are allegorically grouped the Strymon and its navigation, the genii of vintage and harvest and the plodding gnomes of its mines weighed down with their gold and silver burdens? Again, even when the later types are of no special individual interest, they are often deserving of notice as monuments of civic continuity. The later coinages of that ΕΛΕΥΘΕΡΑ ΧΕΡ-CONHCOC to which reference has been already made are passed over for instance with a reference to the *Musée Kotschoubey*. Yet even as a signal example of the survival of free Hellenic life some further attention was due to a city whose autonomous coinage extends over fourteen centuries, and which, in the words of Finlay, 'though surrounded by powerful enemies and barbarous nations,' was still enabled to preserve

'A Homer's language murmuring in her streets
And in her havens many a mast from Tyre.'

It would perhaps be possible to issue a shorter 'Handbook' for educational purposes, but regarded as a 'History,' the present work would considerably gain by greater fullness. Not only do we need a fuller description of many of the types, but the introductory portion might be amplified with advantage. In its present form Mr. Head's *Historia Numorum* is a landmark of numismatic progress. But the subject is too vast for the space accorded to it. In conclusion I cannot do better than express a fervent hope that a second edition of the work may ere long see the light in two volumes and with twice the amount of illustrations.

ARTHUR J. EVANS.

Die Griechischen Vasen mit Meistersignaturen, von WILHELM KLEIN. Second edition; revised and enlarged. 8vo. Pp. xii. 261. Vienna: Carl Gerold's Sohn. 6 Mk.

KLEIN has now made the same advance in his *Meistersignaturen* that he made last year in his *Euphronios*. Ascertaining in the first what works of the Greek vase-painters are still extant, and discussing in detail in the second the extant works of one of the greatest of those painters, Klein some years ago placed the study of this branch of Greek art on new and firmer ground. But books like his, that are the first sure guides to neglected subjects, must always need large additions and some correction; and it is not till they reach a revised edition that their full effect is felt. He is now able to give 424 vases by 103 painters in place of 389 vases by 93 painters. But some minor corrections are still needed: for instance, two vases are said to be at Paris in the

Collection Rayet, which collection was dispersed by auction in the spring of 1879. It should be understood that the book is not by any means a mere catalogue. Many vases are signed by two painters, one with ἐποίησεν and the other with ἔγραψεν, or both with ἐποίησεν. On many vases with signatures there are also other names followed by καλὸς or καλή: and on some there are two or three names with these epithets. Working out the connections thus established, Klein has arranged the painters in a series of groups: and has fixed the sequence of these groups in date by certain broad differences of style. Minor differences of style mark many unsigned vases as the work of these painters: but Klein wisely avoids this point, seeing that it could not be treated convincingly without a mass of costly illustrations. Yet in truth style is often a safer guide than mere signatures. The story of Pheidias and Agoracritos shows that in Greece one artist sometimes signed another's work: and in the case of Duris, for example, one or two vases with his signature are not the least in his usual style, while others that are unsigned exhibit all his mannerisms. This revised edition has five indices: giving, first, the names of the painters; secondly, the names with καλὸς or καλή; thirdly, the subjects represented on the vases; fourthly, the publications in which they are engraved; and fifthly, the collections in which they are preserved. Like the *Euphronios* it has been reduced from an unmanageable quarto pamphlet to a convenient octavo volume. Every one who would study Greek vases must begin with Klein's two books.—C. T.

I regret to learn from M. Salomon Reinach that I was in error in stating last month that he was preparing a catalogue of the Museum at Constantinople to replace the catalogue published by him five years ago and now out of print. M. Reinach informs me that almost all the Celtic and Roman antiquities at the Cluny Museum at Paris have lately been removed to the Museum of Saint Germain, including the very notable collection of Roman glass from the necropolis of Poitiers. He adds that the Museum of Saint Germain has lately acquired a dagger with anthropoid handle in bronze, found in the department of the Charente, which forms an important addition to the small series of such daggers hitherto known.

Cecil Torr.

No acquisition of classical antiquities of any importance has been made at the British Museum during the past month. A scheme has been sanctioned for converting the old Print Room into a gallery of sepulchral monuments. Over two hundred reliefs will be exhibited on the walls, and the floor will be occupied by large sarcophagi. At present the room is cut in two by a floor at an awkward height: this will be removed later on, and a new floor built lower down on a level with that of the Elgin gallery, sufficient space remaining below for a good basement room. Meanwhile the upper rows of reliefs will be built into their permanent places in the walls, those destined for the lower rows remaining for a time on the present floor.—C. T.

When I visited Iasos in the month of March, a vessel of the Turkish navy had just left, which had been engaged for some weeks previously in shipping large blocks of marble extracted from the ruins for use in public works at Constantinople. This and other accessible sites in the neighbourhood have for many years past furnished their tribute for the dockyard and other constructions of the capital. In order to find suitable stones, the captain destroyed a portion of the mediæval wall which surrounds the peninsula, and in the foundations he came across a series of

inscribed bases lying on their sides. With a care, which, had it been exercised by others charged with a similar mission, would have preserved many valuable documents, he had them extracted whole and deposited on board. I trust that they are by this time in the Imperial Museum. Some gentlemen in Choulouk obtained copies of these inscriptions, and I presume they are those published by Contoleon in the *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* for March. If this is so, the circumstances of their discovery have been withheld; and, as the name of Iasos does not appear in any, M. Foucart has been induced to conjecture that they may come from Passala. The wall in question is entirely composed of ancient remains; and were it carefully destroyed, we should probably possess more inscriptions from Iasos than from any site in Turkey.—W. R. PATON.

The *Times* of the 4th of May describes the discovery of an early Christian cemetery near Alexandria. The *Academy* of the 23rd of April contains a report on the necropolis of Tell-el-Yahoudeh; and discusses on the 30th of April and the 7th of May a Roman altar at South Shields. The *Athenaeum* of the 7th of May describes the results of Mr. Penrose's work at the Olympeion at Athens.

Revue Archéologique. Jan.—Feb. 1887. Paris.

1. 'Fouilles de Suse.' M. Dieulafoy gives a short statement of his excavations during 1885-86, accompanied by two coloured plates from the tiled walls of the palace of Darius Hystaspes, representing archers of the royal guard. 2. M. Berthelot publishes the result of his examination of certain metals and minerals from ancient Chaldaea. 5. A letter from M. Ary Renan, communicating an interesting fragment of a green stone cone with a curious Phoenician (?) relief, purchased at Beyrût. 6. An account by M. Cagnat of the Phoenician necropolis of Vaga (*Silius Italicus*, iii. 259) excavated during the Tunis campaign. The mode of sepulture and the forms of tomb are of the characteristic Phoenician types, but, contrary to the usual Phoenician custom, they contained no ornaments of any kind; types of the funerary vases are given on pl. iii. iv. 7. M. Reinach's very important 'Chronique d'Orient' contains as usual all the latest information on current archaeological topics; among much that is valuable is a long report from Mr. Ramsay of his researches in Asia Minor during 1886. 8. M. Mowat contributes the text of a new Gaulish inscription discovered at Orgon.—C. S.

Gazette Archéologique. Jan.—Feb. 1887. Paris.

1. M. Saglio publishes a black-figured oinochoe with the blinding of Polyphemos, formerly in the Campana Collection and now in the Louvre. 2. M. Choisy summarises the course and results of the French excavations at Susa, giving a coloured plate of part of the tiled frieze of lions from the palace of Artaxerxes Mnemon.—C. T.

Gazette des Beaux-Arts. May, 1887. Paris.

2. M. Maxime Collignon on ancient sculpture in the British Museum.—C. T.

Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique. Jan.—Feb. 1887. Athens and Paris.

1. M. Holleaux publishes an archaic female head found within the temple of Apollo Ptoos. 3. M. Pierre Paris describes the excavations at Elatea, at the temple of Athene Cranaia. 8. M. Foucart publishes two inscriptions relating to building at the Peiræus in 394, 393 B.C.—C. T.

The same. March, 1887.

4. M. Holleaux publishes an archaic marble torso of an 'Apollo' and an archaic bronze mirror handle in

the form of a male figure with other fragments, all found within the temple of Apollo Ptoos. 5. M. Lechat describes the excavations undertaken at Peiræus in consequence of the discovery of the inscriptions mentioned above.—C. T.

Ἐφημερίς ἀρχαιολογική. 1886. Part 4. Athens.

1. Philios publishes an inscription relating to building at Eleusis. 5. Stais discusses some late marble statues from Epidauros. 7. Palaiologos Georgiu publishes an inscription from the Acropolis recording the victory of Aischylos with his Oresteia.—C. T.

Athenische Mittheilungen. 1886: part 4. Athens.

1. Dörpfeld discusses, from the architectural side, the newly discovered Peisistratid temple of Athene on the Acropolis. 2. Studniczka announces several happy restorations of statues by fitting together fragments found on the Acropolis. 3. Böhlau publishes an Athenian red-figured pyxis with Perseus and the Graiai. 4. Petersen discusses archaic statues of Nike, in relation to one such lately found on the Acropolis. 5. Schuchhardt fixes the sites of Kolophon, Notion and Klaros; describes their ruins, and publishes some inscriptions found there. 6. Lolling and Wolters describe the domed tomb lately found near Volo.—C. T.

Römische Mittheilungen. 1887: part 1. Rome.

1. Helbig publishes two new busts, one in marble and the other in bronze, of Livia the wife of Augustus. 3. The Conte di Monale describes antiquities found on the site of Fescennium, near Corchiano. 4. Dümmler publishes an inscribed fibula from Preneste.—C. T.

Bullettino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale di Roma. 1887. Rome.

Part 1. 4. Some fragments of sculpture, particularly a youthful Paris or Ganymede. Part 2. 2. Monument of a cobbler, with ingenious treatment of a pair of boots as a pediment group. 3. A head of the youthful Pan. Part 3. 1. Fine bas-relief of the adoration of the Dioscuri. Part 4. 1. Fine Athenian sepulchral relief.—C. T.

Archäologisches Jahrbuch. 1886: part 4. Berlin.

1. Kalkmann discusses representations of Aphrodite on the swan, publishing two red-figured vases in the Berlin Museum with this subject. 2. Heydemann discusses representations of the *φύλακες*, chiefly from vases. 3. Fränkel publishes a vase by Hischylos in the Berlin Museum.—C. T.

The same. 1887: part 1.

1. Michaelis pays a merited tribute to the memory of Wilhelm Henzen. 2. von Sybel publishes a small bronze figure in the British Museum, and a fragment of a helmet with a figure in relief in the Berlin Museum. 3. Dümmler publishes archaic vases, etc. from Tanagra. 4. Milchhöfer discusses reliefs of the presentation of offerings. 5. Böhlau publishes some very early Attic vases. 6. von Rohden publishes a fresco from Pompeii, apparently copied from the Hermes of Praxiteles.—C. T.

Register zur Archäologische Zeitung, Jahrg. I.-XLIII. THE thanks of all archaeologists are due to the German Institute for this excellent index. Only those who have themselves toiled through the back numbers of the *Zeitung* can realise what a labour this register must have entailed in compilation, and what weariness of the spirit it will save in the future.—C. S.

Antike Denkmäler. 1886. Berlin.

This publication—the first of the new series—consists of twelve folio plates and four and a half pages of explanatory text, in a portfolio. It will be noticed at length next month.—C. T.

OBITUARY.

JOHANNES HEINRICH WILHELM HENZEN, commonly called Wilhelm Henzen, was born at Bremen on the 24th of January 1816, and died at Rome on the 27th January 1887. He was trained in his native city, and afterwards in the Universities of Bonn and Berlin; and in 1840 he started on his travels. He came first to Paris and thence to London, acquiring perfect command of English and French; next he went to Rome, and after travelling with Weleker and Ulrichs in Greece and Asia Minor, and in Sicily, in November 1842 he settled at Rome for good. He forthwith joined the Archaeological Institute there, and soon acquired the paramount influence within it which he retained to the last; and it was mainly due to him that the Institute grew from a private association to an Imperial German foundation. In spite of indifferent health, his activity was almost incredible: for besides his better-known work, the correspondence and management of the Institute, and the editing of its *Annali* and *Bullettini* were for many years almost entirely in his hands. He worked at first at Greek antiquities, and the first Latin inscriptions that he published were two from Athens; but he soon found his true sphere, and the volume with which he completed Orelli's collection of select Latin inscriptions established his reputation in all countries as one of the very first authorities on Latin epigraphy. This was not published until 1856, but for fully ten years before he had been busy with the project of a *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*. This project found favour at Berlin; but its execution in the thorough-going way that he desired was not assured until after his friend Theodor Mommsen had set an example with his edition of the Neapolitan inscriptions in 1852. In 1853 the editing of the *Corpus* was entrusted to Henzen, Mommsen, and de Rossi. Henzen's own work is mainly in volume vi., dealing with the Latin inscriptions of the city of Rome; and for this he obtained new material by promoting excavations at the Grove of the Arval Brethren, on whose acts he published an independent treatise. He was moreover one of the founders of the *Ephemeris Epigraphica*. Due honour was rendered at his funeral by the authorities at Rome; and his charming courtesy to strangers will long be remembered in many countries.—CECIL TORR.

CARL SCHAPER, editor of Vergil, died 6 Oct. 1886. His father, who had been enabled to complete his medical studies by the generosity of Heinrich Ritter, afterwards Professor of Philosophy in Göttingen, did much to promote education in Elbing, where the eldest of his eight children, Carl Heinrich Julius, was born 15 March 1828. At the age of seven the boy was sent to Elbing Gymnasium, which he left for Halle University at Michaelmas 1844. In Halle he attended the lectures of Meier, Bernhardt, Pott,

Schaller, Erdmann, Max Duncker, and courses on education and theology. At Easter 1846 he went to Berlin where Franz and Trendelenburg, Lachmann, and especially Boeckh, watched over his studies. His mother's death in 1847, philosophical studies, and the political excitement of the time, kept him in continual agitation. Posting a letter on the 18th of March 1848, he found his return blocked by a barricade, and in the tumult received wounds. In January 1850 he migrated to Königsberg, where he completed his studies under Lobeck and Lehrs. After holding masterships at Danzig, Tilsit, Königsberg, he was appointed in 1861 head master of the Gymnasium at Insterburg; at Michaelmas 1864 Director in Lyck; in July 1868 Sommerbrodt's successor in the Friedrich Wilhelm Gymnasium in Posen; in July 1872 Gustav Kiessling's successor in the important Joachimsthal Gymnasium at Berlin. Here he remained to his death and to him the success of the school in its new quarters is due. The last months of his life were clouded by severe illness, bravely borne. His last connected words were: *Grüsse an das Joachimsthal*.

He spoke Latin fluently and could write Latin verse. His publications on metre and on Vergil induced the Weidmann firm, after Ladewig's death (1874), to entrust him with the revision of their Vergil with German notes, and since 1882 he wrote the report on the Roman bucolic poets for Bursian's Jahresbericht; in 1885, when his mortal sickness was upon him, he further undertook, in the place of the deceased Genthe, the report on the Aeneid for the same serial. The last days before his death he read through Ribbeck's new edition of the text.

For Wölfflin's Archiv. für lat. Lexikographie he undertook to excerpt Hor. c. and epod. and Valerius Flaccus, and lived to send in the answers to about 200 questions.

He belonged to a society of scholars who met weekly, latterly fortnightly, to read together the Greek dramatists. He was so satisfied with the result that he formed a similar circle from the teachers of the Joachimicum. He was also an active member of the Archaeological, Paedagogical and other learned societies, and took an active part in many patriotic, literary and philanthropic agitations. 'Trust in God appeared to him the one true foundation of every society, the family, the school, the state.' (From the obituary notice by G. J. Schneider in Bursian's Jahresbericht, 'Nekrologe' 1886, II. pp. 129—146).

2 March in Tübingen aet. 56 Dr. HERMANN ALF. FREIHERR VON GUTSCHMIDT, Professor of History in the University. His works relate chiefly to eastern history, Egypt, Assyria, Macedonia, Trogus Pompeius. In Hilgenfeld's Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol. III. he had an article 'The apocalypse of Esra and its later recensions.'

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Athenaeum: 26 Mar.; notice of Mahaffy's Alexander's Empire: notes from Athens (opening of American school—Excavation of Delphi) by S. P. Lambros. 9 April: notes from Athens (Excavation of the temple of Zeus Olympius, etc.), by W. Leaf; notice of Gebhardt and Harnack's Texte u. Untersuchungen der altchristlichen Literatur II. 3 and 4. 30 April: Review of Verrall's Septem. 7 May: Review of Morris' Odyssey; short report of Penrose's lecture at Athens on the temple of Zeus Olympius.

Academy: 23 April; notice of Sandys' Easter Vacation in Greece; a letter from Max Müller in defence of the theory that *nomen* is for *gnomen*: 30 April; reviews—Morris' Odyssey by E. D. A. Morshead, of C. Weizsäcker's *das apostolische Zeitalter der christlichen Kirche* by R. B. Drummond, of G. G. Ramsay's *Selections from Tibullus and Propertius* by R. Ellis; a letter from G. F. Browne on the Cod. Amiatinus: 7 May; review of Gertz' Seneca's Dialogues by H. Nettleship, a letter from K. Hamann on Cod. Amiatinus, a letter from W. T. Watkin on an inscription

on a Roman altar found at South Shields: 14 May; review of Mahaffy's *Alexander's Empire* by F. T. Richards, letter from E. A. Gardner on the inscriptions of Naukratis.

Philological Society. The last Abstract of Proceedings (5 Nov. 1886—18 Mar. 1887) gives an account of the following papers:—*Prof. Sayce*, On the origin of the Augment in the Indo-European verb, on the origin of the characteristic *r* of the passive in the Italic and Celtic languages; *Whitley Stokes*, Notes of a Philological tour; *H. Sweet*, The Laws of Sound Change; *J. A. H. Murray*, Annual Report of the Society's New English Dictionary; *J. Boswell*, Sanskrit as parent of the Modern Aryan dialects of India; *H. Bradley*, Gothic personal names; *J. Bannack*, the inscription of Gortyn; *Prof. Skeat*, English Etymologies.

The following articles on classical subjects have appeared in other English Magazines: *Blackwood* (May): Memoir of the Rev. W. Lucas Collins. *Nineteenth Century* (May): The greater Gods of Olympus, II. Apollo, by W. E. Gladstone. *Scottish Review* (April): The apocryphal character of the Moabite Stone, by Rev. A. Löwy; The Subjects of the Byzantine Empire, by D. Bikelas; Recent Archaeology in Euboea. *Walford's Antiquarian* (May): Two short articles on the House of Aldus, Part I., and on Excavations at Ostia.

Expositor, April.—Professor Westcott, writing on the R. V., gives examples of the practical gain arising from its exactness in grammatical details. Mr. J. Macpherson continues the discussion on the Origin of the Christian Ministry. He holds that, in the Apostolic Church, there was but one regular office, that of the presbyter, but that in the larger communities, where several presbyters were required, the presbyters were divided into superior (ἐπίσκοποι) and inferior (διάκονοι); further, that during the first six centuries the ἐπίσκοπος was simply pastor of a congregation.

May.—Professor Harnack gives in chronological order the data we possess for determining the development of the Christian ministry, and then deals more particularly with the original nature of the episcopal office. His conclusion is that both the episcopal and the presbyterial theories are wrong. The development was very complicated. By the end of the first century we find the bishop presiding over the services of the Church, administering its finances, acting as its representative to those without, but himself to some extent controlled by the council of presbyters. English readers will feel less confidence in these results when they learn the cost at which they have been obtained. 'The Epistle to the Ephesians was not written by Paul, but a considerable time after his death.' 'It seems to me very improbable that the Acts of the Apostles was written during the first century.' So the Pastoral Epistles and that of St. James are relegated to the second century. Mr. T. E. Page, in somewhat magisterial style, reproves the Revisers for their rendering of *Acts* i. 16—21. We agree with him on the whole, but cannot think that the latter half of verse 19 was spoken by St. Peter, just after the event referred to. Professor Godet writes on the Epistle to the Ephesians, and Professor Warfield on recent American literature relating to the N. T.

Blätter f. d. Bayer. Gymnasialschulwesen. xxiii (1887) 2. und 3. Heft. L. Dittmeyer, the spuriousness of Aristot. hist. an. bk. ix (part 2).—T. Stangl, Epikritisches zu Cic. or. und Brutus.—G. Schepss, Zu Suetons Fortleben im Mittelalter.—J. Melber,

Zu den angeblich aus Dio Cassius stammenden planudischen Excerpten.—Proschberger handles severely Gebhardt's Ein aesthetischer Kommentar zu den lyr. Dichtungen des Horaz. Paderborn. 1885.—Reviews (1) of Leo's *Plautus* vol. i (Berlin, Weidmann, 1885) by Weissenhorn; (2) of L. Müller's *Der saturnische Vers* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1885) by 'E.' (3) of Wecklein's ed. of Wolfg. Bauer's *Eurip. Herakl.*, München, 1885, and of Wecklein's 2nd ed. of *Soph. Antig.* (ib. 1885) by K. Metzger. (4) of W. Christ, *Platonische Studien* (Abh. d. bayer. Akad. 1 Cl. xvii Bd ii. Abt.) by Baumann (5) of Slaneeczká's researches into *Dem. de f. l.* (Wien, Holder, 1885) by H. Ortner. (6) of Ed. Kurtz, *Die Sprichwörter-sammlung des Maximus Planudes* (Leipzig, Neumann, 1886) and of Wölfflin, *Sprüche der sieben Weisen* (Sitzungsber. d. bayer. Akad. 1886, reviewed also by Studemund in the *Wochenschr. f. klass. Philol.* No. 50, 1886) and H. Schenkl, *Pythagoreersprüche* (Wiener Studien 1886), the original of the Syriac version printed by Gildemeister in *Hermes* iv 81 seq.), all by Krumbacher (Dr. J. Scheibmeyer in Munich has long been collecting similar selections of maxims). (7) of Mommsen's *History*, vol. v, by Gruber. Shorter notices of (1) Weissenborn's *Livy*. I 1 Bk. 1 (8th ed. by H. J. Müller, Berl. Weidmann, 1885). (2) *Tac. hist. erklärt* von Ed. Wolff. I (bk. I II. Berl. Weidmann, 1886). (3) *Tac. opera. Rec.* Joh. Müller. II hist. et op. minora. (Prag, Tempsky, 1887). (4) G. Gemss, *Wörterb.* zu . . . Corn. Nep. Paderborn, Schoeningh. 1886. (5) *Corn. Nep. . . v. J. Siebelis*. 11th ed. by M. Jancovius (Leipzig, Teubner 1885).—Heft 4. L. Dittmeyer, the spuriousness of *Arist. h. an. bk. ix* (pt. iii and last).—Reviews (1) by C. Hammer of *H. Nohl Cic. oratt. selectae. iii de imp. Pomp. in Catil. orr. iv.* Lips. Freytag. 1886. pp. xvi, 65, 2) by Hans Kern of *Vergili Aeneis schol. in usum ed. W. Klouček* (bibl. script. gr. et rom. ed. cur. C. Schenkl). ibid. 1886. pp. ii. 338. geb. 1 M. 50 Pf.; (3) by H. Stadtmüller of *Eurip. Medea*. Zweite Aufl. erklärt von Hans v. Arnim. Berlin, Weidmann. 1886. pp. xxvi, 120. 1 M. 50 Pf. (not a revision of Schöne's edition, but an entirely new work).

Mnemosyne. Nova Series. xv (1887), pt. 2. Lugd. Bat. Brill. *Quaestiones Graecae*, II. De Ostracismo, scripsit T. M. J. Valetón (criticisms, e.g., of Grote).—*Platonica*, scripsit H. van Herwerden (continuation of notes on Plato printed in his *Lectiones Rhetoricae*, Lugd. Bat. 1882, pp. 21–60. Deals with Hipp. maior and minor, Ion, Menexenus, Clitophon, Phaedrus, and schol. Phileb. p. 56e).—*Ad Lucianum*, scripsit K. G. P. Schwartz (continued from xiv 233. Deals with *Asinus*, *Iuppiter conf.* and *Iuppiter trag.*, *Jearomenippus*).—*Ad Aristoph.* Pac. 48, 1159, scripsit J. van Leeuwen, Jr.—*De Tibulli elegiarum structura*, scripsit H. T. Karsten (defends the vulgate from the transpositions of Haase, Ribbeck, Prién, R. Richter, Fritzsche, Baehrens).—*Ad Aen. vi* 579 sq., scripsit P. Hoekstra (transposes *caeli* and *terrae*).—*Addendum ad Catull.* 6 10, scripsit J. P. Postgate (his conjecture *cassa* had been anticipated).

Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie u. Pädagogik, ed. Fleckeisen u. Masius, Leipzig, 1887. Zweites Heft contains (1) B. Keil, *Antiphon κατά τῆς μητρίας*, a general criticism of the speech. (2) A. Ludwig, *Zum Homerischen Hermes hymnos*, three emendations, viz. v. 152, ἦν πάλλῃσι παρ' ἰγνύσι λαῖφος, v. 259, λυγροῖσιν, v. 427, κραίνοντ'. (3) K. Tümpel, *Kallone*, some notes on this goddess. (4) K. Brugmann, *der Ursprung von ἀλλήλων*, explaining the word on the analogy of 'einander,' 'one another.' (5) F. Polle, *Zu Thukydides*, suggesting in II. 20, 4, the reading *τρισχίλιοι γὰρ πολίται* for *ὄπλιται*. (6) A. Schmidt,

die Archonten Nikodemus u. Agathokles u. das stumme Iota, determining the date of Agathocles by palaeographical considerations. (7) P. Schulze, *Lucianos als Quelle für die Kenntnis der Tragödie*, a collection of notices of the tragic drama in Lucian. (8) H. Magnus, *Zu den Metamorphosen des Ovidius*, a discussion of l. 15 (suggesting *utque aether tellus*) VI. 53-58, V. 460, VII. 47, IX. 414-418. (9) W. Gilbert, *Zur Erklärung von Martialis Epigrammen*, a number of small criticisms on Friedländer's edition. (10) K. Haackmann, *Zu Ciceros Reden gegen Verres*, suggesting in IV. 9, *privatis in rebus for parvis in*

Romanische Forschungen, Organ für romanische Sprachen und Mittellatein herausgegeben von KARL VOLLMÖLLER. Erlangen, A. Deichert.

Band I 1883. (Many of the articles do not fall into the province of the *Review*). K. Hoffmann, T. M. Auracher, *Der Langobardische Dioskorides des Marcellus Virgilius* pp. 49-106 (book I only is as yet printed. The editors have left in the text many impossible forms, which a reference to the Greek would have enabled them to correct. Thus in p. 51 (last line) they cite *acrum* as occurring in f° 27^a. The words there are 'ignem acrum.' *Ignis sacer* seems to have been written as one word, *ignisacer*. In several places this mistake occurs: in f° 29^a *ignem sacrum* appears as *igie acrum*. I hope to write for the *Journal of Philology* a paper on the text and latinity of this very important example of low Latin).—Hermann Rönseh, *Die lexicalischen Eigenthümlichkeiten der Latinität des sogen. Hegesippus*, pp. 256-321. (maintains, against Fr. Vogel, *De Hegesippo, qui dicitur, Josephi interprete*, Erlangen 1880, the identity of Hegesippus and Ambrose).—W. Foerster, *Das italienische dunque und dessen Herkunft*, pp. 322-325 (from *donique*, confounded with *denique*).—Hermann Rönseh, *Textkritische Bemerkungen zum Longobardischen Dioskorides*, pp. 413-414.—Fr. Vogel, *Zu Hegesippus* pp. 415-417 (additions and corrections to Rönseh's paper in pp. 256-321).—Hermann Rönseh, *Zur biblischen Latinität aus dem cod. Sangallensis der Evangelien*, pp. 419-426.

Band II Heft 2. 1885. C. Fritzche, *Die lateinischen Visionen des Mittelalters bis zur Mitte des 12. Jahrhunderts.* Ein Beitrag zur Culturgeschichte, pp. 247-279 (a valuable contribution to the illustration of Bede, h. e. v 12-14, of Dante and of St. Patrick's purgatory. The conclusion, promised for the next part, has not yet appeared).—Hermann Rönseh, *Lexikalische Excerpte aus weniger bekannten lateinischen Schriften.* Erste Serie. Aus der Uebersetzung der Apostelgeschichte im Codex *Gigas* der Stockholmer Bibliothek, pp. 280-301.—The same, *Lexikalisches aus Leidener lateinischen Juvenalscholia der Karolingerzeit*, pp. 302-313 (from the scholia on Sat. III in cod. Voss. 18 saec. x, published by Schopen, Bonn, 1847).—The same, *Etymologische Miscellen* pp. 314-316.—The same, *Das Subst. bolunda* pp. 317-318.—The same, *Das Adjectiv praeostentus*, pp. 318-319.—The same, *Das Adjectiv cerrosus* pp. 319-320.

II Heft 3. 1886. C. v. Paucker, *Die Latinität des Joannes Cassianus* pp. 391-448.—Hermann Rönseh, *Lexikalische Excerpte aus weniger bekannten lateinischen Schriften.* Zweite Serie. Aus dem Anonymus Valesii, aus Lucani *Commenta Bernensia*, aus dem *Chronographus* vom Jahre 354 und *Polemii Silvii Laterculus* pp. 449-472.—The same, *Etymologisches.* Das französische *la troussé* (from *toroca*). Das italienische *corone* (in support of Ferrari's derivation, adopted by Diez, from *corus*, Rönseh cites Philargyr. on Verg. g. II 517 *mergites* . . . *quidam cavos dicunt*). Ital. *brocco*, français. *broche* (from *βρόχος*) pp. 473-476.

Vol. III Heft 1. 1886 contains only a French poem of the 13 cent.

The second part of vol. III will contain: Jul. Zupitza: on what text is the O. E. version of the story of Apollonius of Tyre founded; also a conjecture on Aldhelm.—Herm. Rönseh, *Lexikalische Excerpte*, ser. 3.

Later will appear: the continuation of Dioscorides; the Oxford Benedictine rule (saec. VII) ed. by Konrad Hofmann.

Zeitschrift für oesterr. Gymnasien. xxxviii (1887) Heft 2. I H. Rönseh: Latein aus entlegenen Quellen. New words, or new examples, or strange forms from (1) Apulei (?) *Physiognomia* (in Rose's *Anecdota*, Berl. 1864, vol. i). (2) *Liber Monstrorum* (in Haupt's *Opusc.* ii, Leipz. 1876). (3) *Acta S. Timothei*, ed. Usener (1877). (4) *Scholia Bobiensia* and *Scholiasta Gronovianus* (in Orelli's *Cicero*, vol. v pt. 2). (5) *Fragmentum evang. S. Lucae Ambrosianum*, saec. 6 (in Ceriani's *Monumenta*, i, Mediol. 1861). The shortened forms *desirium* (for *desiderium*, Cacl. Aurel. chron. i § 77) and *desiro* (Itin. Alex. c. 27 p. 15, 9 ed. Volkm.) carry back the origin of our *desire*, subst. and verb, to low Latin.—II A Scheindler, favorable review of A. Breusing's *Die Nautik der Alten*. Bremen. 1886. III J. Kirste, favorable review of Turoman, *Greek grammar*. Belgrade 1886. The first ever published in the Servian language. IV A. Kornitzer, favorable reviews of (1) C. Meissner's *Cic. Cato maior.* 2 umgearb. Aufl. Leipz. Teubner 1885. (2) F. Hofmann's *ausgewählte Briefe von Cicero*. Berlin, Weidmann. 1 5th ed. 1884. II 2 ed by G. Andresen. 1885. V Tegge, *Studien zur latein. Synonymik* (Berl. Weidmann. 1886) recommended by J. Golling. VI E. Engelbrecht *Claudiani Mamerti opera* (Vienna 1885) recommended by H. St. Sedlmayer. VII J. M. Stowasser attests 'the enormous importance' of Huemer's *Virgili Maronis grammaticae opera*, Teubner. 1886 and makes several suggestions for a new edition.

Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift. Feb. 12. H. Holtzinger, *Kunsthistorische Studien* (K. Lange). 'Interesting so far as it deals with the origins of ecclesiastical architecture.' The greater part of the notice is taken up with the reviewer's own theory.—K. Abicht, *Herodotos iii. und iv. für den Schulgebrauch erklärt* (W. Gemoll). 'New editions, essentially identical with the previous ones.'—C. Frick, *Die Quellen Augustini im xviii. Buche seiner Schrift de civitate Dei* (H. Rönseh). 'Complete and accurate.'—A. Delattre, *L'Asie occidentale dans les Inscriptions Assyriennes* (Schrader). 'Useful.'—O. Schrader, *Linguistisch-historische Forschungen zur Handelsgeschichte und Warenkunde* (G. Meyer). 'Treats a difficult subject with great skill and competent knowledge.'—H. Collitz, *Die neueste Sprachforschung und die Erklärung des indogermanischen Ablautes* (H. Ziemer). 'Vehement rather than convincing.'

Feb. 19. J. Kräl, *Sophoclis Tragediae.* ii: *Antigona* (H. Müller). 'Careful text-recension; notes in Bohemian.'—A. Neupert, *De Demosthenicarum quae feruntur epistularum fide et auctoritate* (W. Nitsche). 'A careful examination, especially on considerations of language, resulting in a verdict of spuriousness.' Reviewer makes some important contributions to the discussion.—O. Guthling, *P. Vergili Maronis Bucolica Georgica Aeneis* (W. Gebhardt). 'A Teubner text, intended to take the place, in schools, of Ribbeck's edition, which is objected to by conservative teachers. Lacks critical insight.'—J. N. Madvig, *Titi Livii historiarum romanarum libri qui supersunt, ex recensione J. N. Madvigii. Quartum ediderunt J. N. Madvigius et J. L. Usingius.* Pol. ii. 1, *libros a xxi*

ad exram continens (-σ). Reviewer notices various emendations and agreements with other scholars in Book 21.—H. Sauppe, *De Phratris Atticis commentatio* [Göttingen program] (Thalheim). 'Valuable.'—N. H. Michel, *Du droit de cité romain. Études d'épigraphie juridique. I. Des signes distinctifs de la qualité de citoyen romain* [sic] (P. Willems). 'Discursive, not free from mistakes.'—H. Berger, *Geschichte der wissenschaftlichen Erdkunde der Griechen. Erste Abtheilung. Die geographie der Ionier* (D. Detlefsen). 'Text and notes contain an astonishing wealth of learning.'—G. J. Allman, *Greek Geometry from Thales to Euclid* (F. Hutsch). Descriptive notice.

Feb. 26. Oskar Sommer, *Gottfried Semper* (R. Borrmann). Descriptive notice; reviewer had written on Semper as an archaeologist in the *Wochenschrift*, 1885, 9 and 10.—Auguste Franchetti, *Le Rane di Aristofane tradotte in versi italiani con introduzione e note di Domenico Comparetti* (C. v. Holzinger). 'Shows taste, and some poetical power.'—R. Wagner, *De Infinitivo apud oratores Atticos cum articulo coniuncto* [Schwerin program.] (W. Nitsche). 'Laborious and sensible.'—P. Uhle, *Quæstiones de Orationum Demostheni falso addictarum scriptoribus. Particula altera: De Orationum 33, 34, 56 scriptoribus* (W. Nitsche). 'Has merits, though certainty may be impossible.'—A. Schäfer, *Demosthenes und seine Zeit. 2te Ausg. 2 Band* (Th. Thalheim). 'Revision carefully carried out by Max Hoffmann after the death of the author, who had only revised vol. i.'—Th. Oesterlen, *Komik und Humor bei Horaz. Zweiter Heft: Die Oden*. (W. Mewes). 'Exaggerated: caricatures Horace.'—Julius Asbach, *Cornelius Tacitus* (A. Eussner). 'Interesting, if unsound.'—A. Cartault, *De quelques représentations de navires empruntées à des vases primitifs provenant d'Athènes* (E. Assmann). 'Conclusions cannot be accepted unhesitatingly.'—P. Willems, *Les élections municipales à Pompéi* (M. Voigt). 'Careful and important.'—H. Daniel-Lacombe, *Le droit funéraire à Rome* (M. Voigt). 'Not on a level with the recent literature of the subject.'

March 5. H. Collitz, *Die neueste Sprachforschung und die Erklärung des indogermanischen Ablautes* (K. Brugmann). Detailed polemic, with a good deal of personality.—Georg Ranscher, *De scholiis Homeris ad rem metricam pertinentibus* (A. Ludwig). 'A good idea, not quite satisfactorily worked out.'—Franz Müller, *Dispositionen zur den Reden bei Thukydides* (G. Behrendt). 'Well adapted for schools.'—J. Proschberger, *Fünf Oden des Horaz in moderner deutscher Uebersetzung* [Regensburg program] (W. Mewes). 'Of more than average merit.'—B. Dahl, *Zur Handschriften-kunde und Kritik des ciceronischen Cato Maior. II. Codices Parisini* (H. Deiter). Descriptive notice.—P. Schwenke, *Des Presbyter Hadoardus Cicero-excerpte nach E. Narduccis Abschrift des Cod. Vat. Reg. 1762* (H. Deiter). 'Important for the text-criticism of Cicero.'—E. Kurtz, *Tierbeobachtung und Tierliebhaberei der alten Griechen* (O. Keller). 'Slight and defective.'—A. F. Pott, *Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft und Carl Abel's Aegyptische Sprachstudien* = Einzelbeiträge zur allgemeinen und vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaft (H. Ziemer). Descriptive notice of Pott's examination of Abel's theories.

Rivista di Filologia e d' Istruzione Classica (ed. Comparetti, Müller, and Flechia, Turin). Anno XV. Fasc. 1 and 2. 1886 contains (1) Remigius Sabbadini, *Quæ libris III et VII Aeneidos cum universo poemate ratio intercedat*, showing, among other things, by a minute analysis of the inconsistencies of the Aeneid, that Book VII. was composed after Books VIII.-XI.,

and that Book III. was composed after Books I. II., IV.-VII. (2) G. Bertolotto, *Il Codice Modenese di Luciano*, an account of this MS., which contains twenty-six works, and is assigned to the tenth or eleventh century. A full collation of the *δίκη φωνηέντων* and other notes are added. (3) Luigi Valmaggi, *Notizia di un Codice Eporediese delle Etimologie di Isidoro*, an account, with partial collation, of the MS. of the *Origines* in the Capitol of Ivrea. Fasc. 3-6 contain (1) E. Pais, *Straboniana*, an article of 150 pages, dealing chiefly with Strabo's obligations to earlier writers for the description of countries which he had not visited. (2) F. Ramorino, *Notizia di alcuni manoscritti Italiani del Cato Major e del Laelius*, with a collation of three Laurentian MSS. (I. 45, XLV. 2, and LXVI. 32) of the Cato Major. Reviews of various school editions are also included.

B. Stade's Zeitschrift f. d. Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft. Giessen. Heft I. 1887. F. Baethgen (pp. 1-60) concludes his investigation of seventeen Psalms (see *Ztschr. f. d. Alt. Wiss.* 1886, pp. 261-288) which Theodore of Mopsuestia in his commentary seems to have treated as Maccabean, representing David as having composed them *ἐκ προσώπου τῶν Μακκαβαίων*. Baethgen gives copious extracts from Theodore's commentary, which he reproduces from Corderius' Catena (Antwerp. 1643-1646). He thus brings into notice many passages of Theodore's commentary, which do not appear in Migne's edition (Tom. 66, Series Graeca). He quotes at length (pp. 7-10) a very valuable passage, where Theodore compares the versions of Symmachus and the LXX and criticises their style of translation. In another place (p. 40) Baethgen shows that the Greek text of Theodore's commentary upon Ps. lxxix. 22 differs considerably from the Latin text given in Migne's edition. As the Greek version does not adopt the view that the primary application of the passage was to New Testament events, the variation in the Latin seems to denote an attempt to improve upon Theodore's sentiments in an orthodox direction. The historical references to Maccabean times show thorough acquaintance with the books of Maccabees. Theodore's comments are based upon the LXX version.—S. Reckendorf (pp. 61-90) contributes an article upon the value of the Ethiopic version for the reconstruction of the text of the LXX. He gives examples of the variations found in the Ethiopic version in the course of a brief collation of Genesis, and concludes that those variations are not to be accounted for by the carelessness of scribes, but by the character of the text employed by the translators. He will not commit himself upon the question whether the Ethiopic does not show traces of the influence of an Arabic or a Coptic translation upon which it was based. He calls attention to the marked agreement in certain passages of the Ethiopic with MS. 129 of the LXX.—The number concludes with a brief notice of E. Vischer's theory of a Hebrew original for the Apocalypse. Accepting Vischer's conclusions the writer gives a full list of the words, phrases, and passages, which he thinks an analysis of the book shows to have been interpolated by the Greek translator into his rendering from the Hebrew.

Theologisch Tijdschrift, xxi. 2. March 1887. Dr. H. P. Berlage criticises *Ferisimilia* Civ. § 3 ('quaestio de mulieribus' in 1 Cor. xi. 1-16). The results, he thinks, are obtained by violence done to the text, and the authors cannot escape the charge of precipitation.—J. H. A. Michelsen continues his 'critical investigation of the original text of the Epistle to the Romans'; in the present article, following in the

steps of C. H. Weisse, he endeavours to free the text of the Epistle from interpolations, amounting to a very considerable portion of the whole; some of these are 'inappropriate quotations from the O. T.' [e.g. III. 13-18], others additions of a miscellaneous character [e.g. V. 1-11]. He distinguishes five recensions of the Epistle, and supposes the connexion with the Romans to have been introduced in the second.—Dr. J. A. Bruins defends his interpretation of Augustine Brev. Coll. III. 13 15 *dimisit e autem in basilica novorum quaecunque reproba scripta haereticorum* against Heer van Gilse; (a) *dimisit* means 'left behind'; (b) *bas. novorum* are to be taken together; for the latter should be read *Novarum*, perhaps an abbreviation for *Novatianorum*. Reviews: *La religion à Rome sous les Sévères* par Jean Réville by C. P. Tiele (a masterpiece in its way; but the author should have avoided such words as 'Pagans,' and might have traced more clearly the earlier manifestations of the religious phenomena which mark the age of the Severi); *Priscillian, ein neugefundener Lat. Schriftsteller des 4. Jahrhunderts.* Vortrag von Dr. Georg Schepps by Dr. M. A. N. Rovers ('In the tracts published the supposed Priscillianus expresses the

greatest aversion to all heresies, especially Manicheism; whereas the real Pr. was represented by his contemporaries as the great heretic and follower of the Manichees')

CORRIGENDA.—p. 92, col. 1, for *δέατοι* read *δέαται*. col. 2, for 'in the middle of the refrain' read 'by the refrain.'

p. 105, col. 1, for 'Sanskrit -mānā, corresponding generally to -μενο, is always oxytone' read 'Sanskrit -mānā was probably at first oxytone, as in *sasrmānā*; though these participles have regularly taken the accent of the present stem, as *yājamāna*: but this accentuation is almost certainly un-original.'

p. 114, heading, for *νικήφορος* read *νικηφόρος*. l. 16, for *οὐκ ἂν ἀσχολοίη* read *οὐ πόνους ἔασει*.

p. 121, col. 2, l. 14, for 'and *fraglare* = *flagrare* kept its form and sense till the African Latin, appeared, when it became *fraglare*' read 'are discussed. To avoid the repetition of *r*, *fraglare* got changed in vulgar speech either into *flagrare* or *fraglare*; and the confusion was increased when the latter form came to be used also in the sense of 'burn,' as in Fronto and other Africans.'

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

BOOKS PUBLISHED IN ENGLAND.

Aldred (P. F.) Grammatical Notes on the Plutus of Aristophanes, together with an Introduction and a Selection of Hard Passages. 12mo. 18 pp. Cambridge. Hall. 2s.

Antoninus. Meditations. Translated from the Greek by Jeremy Collier, revised with Introduction and Notes by A. Zimmern. Post 8vo. 236 pp. London. W. Scott. 1s.

Avianus. The fables of Avianus, edited with Prolegomena, Critical Apparatus, Commentary, Excursus, and Index, by Robinson Ellis, M.A., LL.D. 8vo. xli. 161 pp. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 18s. 6d.

Cyril (St.) Five lectures on the mysteries and other sacramental treatises edited with Translations by the Rev. H. de Romestin. 16mo. vi. 137 pp. Oxford. Parker. 3s.

Herodotus. Book VIII. 1-190. With Introduction and Notes by E. S. Shuckburgh. 12mo. 190 pp. Cambridge. Pitt Press. 3s. 6d.

Jerram (C. S.) *Anglice Reddenda*; or, Extracts for

Unseen Translation for the use of Middle and Higher Forms. Second Series. 12mo. 210 pp. London. Frowde. 3s.

Ovid. *Epistolarum ex Ponto liber primus*. With Introduction and Notes by C. H. Keene. Post 8vo. 96 pp. London. Bell and Sons. 3s.

Plautus. *Captivi*. With Introduction and Notes by W. M. Lindsay. 12mo. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 2s. 6d.

Suppho. Memoir, Text, Selected Renderings, and a Literal Translation by H. J. Wharton, 2nd edition. 12mo. 222 pp. London. Stott. 7s. 6d.

Smith (A.) *Through Cyprus*. 8vo. ix. 351 pp. Map and cuts. London. Hurst and Blackett. 15s.

Sophocles. *Antigone*. The text closely rendered and illustrated with short notes preceded by an Introduction and Analysis by R. Broughton. Post 8vo. 120 pp. Oxford. Shrimpron. 3s. 6d.

Turner (B. D.) *An elementary syntax of the Latin cases*. 16mo. 19 pp. London. Rivingtons. 1s.

BOOKS PUBLISHED ON THE CONTINENT.

Ast. *Zur Topographie von Rhegien und Messina*. 4to. (36 pp.) Grimsa, Gensel. 1 Mk.

Barthold (Th.) *Krit.-exegetische Untersuchungen zu des Euripides Medea und Hippolytos*. 4to. 42 pp. Hamburg. 2 Mk. 50.

Breidt (H.) *De Aurelio Prudentio Clemente Horatii imitatore*. 8vo. 52 pp. Heidelberg. Winter. 1 Mk. 60.

Buchwald (F.) *Quaestiones Silianae*. 8vo. (32 pp.). Leipzig. Fock. 80 Pf.

Büdinger (M.) *Zeit und Schicksal bei Römern und Westarier*. 8vo. 32 pp. Vienna. Gerold. 60 Pf.

Busche (C.) *Observationes criticae in Euripidis Troades*. 8vo. 48 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 75 Pf.

Cicero. *Rede für T. Annus Milo*. Für d. Schulgebrauch erklärt von R. Bouterwek. 8vo. A. Kommentar unter dem Text. III. 90 pp. B. Text und Kommentar getrennt. III. 41. 48 pp. Gotha. Perthes. Each 1 Mk. 20.

— *Dell' oratore libri tre*. Testo riveduto ed annotato da A. Cima. Lib. II. 8vo. xx. 156 pp. Turin. Loescher. 2 l. 50 c.

Corpus juris civilis nella sua miglior lezione secondo

gli studi più recenti con richiami alle diverse sue parte e alle disposizioni del codice civile italiano e delle varie legislazioni moderne. 8vo. Fasc. 22-31, pp. 989-1542. Rome. Perino. Each part 50 c.

Demosthenes. L'orazione per la corona, commentata da D. Bassi. 8vo. lxx. 258 pp. Turin. Loescher. 4 lire.

Dilthey (C.) *De epigrammatum graecorum syllogis quibusdam minoribus commentatio*. 4to. Göttingen. Dietrich. 80 Pf.

Dissertationes philologicae Vindobonenses. Vol. I. 8vo. 348 pp. Prague. Tempsky. 7 Mk.

Eagelmann (Th.) *De custodiæ praestatione nach römischen Recht*. 8vo. Nördlingen. Beck. 3 Mk.

Gallien (K.) *Lateinische Schulgrammatik*. 8vo. iv. 100 pp. Berlin. Simion. 1 Mk.

Gaspari (A.) *de Fabio Planciade Fulgentio, Virgilii interprete*. (extr. Berl. Studien.) 8vo. 44 pp. Berlin. Calvary and Co. 1 Mk. 60.

Glück (F.) *Commentario alle Pandette tradoto e arricchito di copiose note; direttori professori F. Serafini e P. Cogliolo*. Disp. II.-XXIII. Libri I.-III. trad. da C. Ferrini, Libro IV. trad. da L.

- Landucci. 8vo. pp. 81-768, 1-48, 1-96, 1-192. Milan, Vallardi. Each part 1 lira.
- Gomperz (Th.) Zu Heraklit's Lehre und den Ueberresten seines Werkes (*extr.* Sitzungs. d. K. K. Akad. d. Wiss.) 8vo. 61 pp. Vienna. Gerold. 1 Mk.
- Hauler (E.) Neue Bruchstücke zu Sallusts Historien (*extr.* Sitzungs. d. K. K. Akad. d. Wiss.) 8vo. 66 pp. Vienna. Gerold. 1 Mk.
- Herodoti historiarum liber V. et VI. Scholarum in usum rec. A. Holder. 8vo. vii. 48, vii. 47 pp. Prague. Tempsky. Each 40 Pf.
- Herwerden (H. van.) Lucubrationes Sophocleae. 8vo. Utrecht. Beijero. 1 fl.
- Hess (G.) Curae Annaeanae. Pars I. 4to. 26 pp. Altona. 80 Pf.
- Homeri. Iliadis carmina ed. A. Rzach. Pars II.: XIII.-XXIII. 12mo. 375 pp. Prague. Tempsky. 1 Mk.
- Ilias. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt v. G. Stier. IV.-VI. 8vo. 119. 230 pp. Gotha. Perthes. 3 Mk.
- L'Odyssée. Texte grec revu et corrigé d'après les diorthoses alexandrines, accompagné d'un commentaire critique et explicatif et suivi de la Batrachomyomachie, des hymnes homériques, etc., par A. Pierron. 2nd edition. Chants I.-XII. 8vo. 542 pp. Paris. Hachette. 9 fr.
- Odyssea, scholarum in usum ed. P. Cauer. Pars II. Rhaps. XIII.-XXIV. 12mo. 228 pp. Prague. Tempsky. 1 Mk.
- Illmann (P.) De Tibulli codicis Ambrosiani auctoritate. 8vo. 85 pp. Halle. (1886.) 1 Mk. 50.
- Joel (K.) Zur Erkenntnis der geistigen Entwicklung und der schriftstellerischen Motive Platos. 8vo. 90 pp. Berlin. Heyfelder.
- Kaiser (R.) de inscriptionum graecarum interpunctione. 8vo. 38 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk.
- Koch (J.) Quaestionum de proverbiiis apud Aeschylum, Sophoclem, Euripidem caput I. 8vo. 92 pp. Königsberg. 1 Mk. 50.
- Kruse (H.) Über Interpolationen in Xenophon's Hellenika. 4to. 30 pp. Kiel. 2 Mk.
- Landucci (L.) Storia del diritto romano dalle origini fino al Giustiniano; corso scolastico. Fasc. II.-VI. 8vo. pp. 65-384. Padova. Sachetti. 5 lire.
- Longinus. Διονυσίου ἡ Λογγίνου περὶ ὑψηλοῦς. De sublimitate libellus in usum scholarum ed. O. Jahn, iterum ed. J. Vahlen. 8vo. xii. 80 pp. Bonn. Marcus. 2 Mk. 40
- Lucius. L'âne. Traduction de P.-L. Courier. 32mo. xxiv. 132 pp. 4 vignettes. 12 full-page plates. Paris. Quantin. 10 fr.
- Lysias. Ausgewählte Reden. Für d. Schulgebrauch erklärt von W. Kocks. 8vo. V. 105. 199 pp. Gotha. Perthes. 3 Mk.
- Mazegger (B.) Römerfunde in Obermais bei Meran und die alte Maja Veste. 8vo. 31 pp. Meran. Pötzlberger. 80 Pf.
- Mehler (G.) Beiträge zur Bildung des griechischen Verbuns. I. Verba contracta mit langen Themavocal. II. Flexion des activen Plusquamperfects. 8vo. 90 pp. Dorpat. 1 Mk. 50.
- Meyer (A.) de compositione theogoniae Hesiodae. 8vo. 102 pp. Berlin. Mayer and Müller. 2 Mk.
- Platonis opera quae feruntur omnia ed. Schanz. Vol. III. fasc. I. Sophista. 8vo. ix. 92 pp. Leipzig. B. Tauchnitz. 2 Mk.
- Plutarchi de proverbiiis Alexandrinorum libellus ineditus, rec. et praefatus est C. Crusius. 4to. 34 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 2 Mk. 80.
- Quintiliani institutionis oratoriae liber X. Ed. F. Meister. 12mo. xiii. 40 pp. Prague. Tempsky. 25 pf.
- liber VII.-XII. 12mo. ii. 363 pp. Prague. Tempsky. 1 Mk. 50.
- Roby (J.) Introduzione allo studio del digesto Giustiniano. Traduzione di G. Pacchioni con prefazione di P. Cogliolo. 8vo. xxiv. 295 pp. Florence. Cammelli. 5 lire.
- Rochrig (A.) De P. Nigidio Figulo capita II. 8vo. viii. 42 pp. Coburg. Riemann. 1 Mk. 50.
- Saarman (Th.) De Oenomao Gadareno. 8vo. 31 pp. Leipzig. 1 Mk.
- Schwartz (E.) Scholia in Euripidem, collegit, recensuit, edidit E. Schwartz. Vol. I. Scholia in Hecubam, Orestem, Phoenissas. 8vo. xvi. 415 pp. Berlin. G. Reimer. 9 Mk.
- Schweter (F. M.) Bemerkungen zu Strabo. 4to. 17 pp. Leipzig. Hinrichs. 1 Mk.
- Streit (W.) Zur Geschichte des 2. punischen Krieges in Italien nach der Schlacht von Cannae. (*extr.* Berl. Studien). 8vo. 57 pp. Berlin. Calvary and Co. 2 Mk.
- Taciti opera quae supersunt. Rec. J. Müller. Vol. II. Historiae et opera minora. 12mo. 360 pp. Prague. Tempsky. 1 Mk. 50.
- Theocrite. Les Idylles, traduites envers par Ph. le Duc. 8vo. 139 pp. Bourg. Marin-Bottier. 3 fr.
- Vanni (A.) La universalità del diritto romano e le sue cause. 8vo. 62 pp. Urbino.
- Vergili carmina selecta, scholarum in usum ed. E. Eichler. 12mo. xxx. 200 pp. 2 plates. Prague. Tempsky. 1 Mk.
- Aeneide. Textausgabe f. d. Schulgebrauch mit. e. Aufsatz über d. Dichter, Inhaltsangaben, und Verzeichnis, der Eigennamen. 8vo. xxiv. 282 pp. Paderborn. Schöningh. 1 Mk. 50.
- Wrobel (V.) Aristotelis de perturbationibus animi doctrina. 8vo. Leipzig. Fock. Mk. 1. 20.
- Xenophon. Memorabilien. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von E. Weissenborn. III. IV. 8vo. iii. 93-181 pp. Gotha. Perthes. 2 Mk. 40.
- Zimmermann (E.) De epistulari temporum usu Ciceroniano Quaestiones Grammaticales. II. 4to. 31 pp. Rostenburg 1 Mk.

UNIVERSITY INTELLIGENCE.

(Continued from page 171.)

OXFORD.

UNIVERSITY SCHOLARSHIPS: *Mathematical Senior Sch.*, Herschel Astron. Prize, C. E. Haselfoot, New (Winchester); *Accessit*, C. H. Thompson, Queens (Hoddesdon); *Junior Sch.*, A. L. Dixon, Worcester (Kingswood); *Exh.*, J. S. Tucker, Balliol (Bristol); *Accesserunt*, R. C. Fowler, New (Winchester), J. L. S. Hatton, Hertford (Ashby); *Radeliffe (Medical) Fellowship*, W. Overend, Balliol (Royal School of Mines).

UNIVERSITY PRIZES: *Latin Verse*, R. R. Marett, Balliol (Jersey); *Greek Verse*, F. W. Hall, Trinity (S. Paul's); *Acc.*, G. I. Simey, Balliol (Rugby);

G. C. Richards, Balliol (Rugby); *Greek Prose*, G. G. A. Murray, S. John's (Merchant Taylors'); *Acc.*, S. A. Alexander, Trinity (S. Paul's); *English Verse*, S. A. Alexander, Trinity (S. Paul's); *English Essay*, H. W. Horwill, Wadham (Shebbear); *Ellerton Essay*, E. E. Kellett, Wadham (Kingswood); *Poem on Sacred Subject*, W. H. Savile, Keble (Haileybury); *Green Moral Philosophy Prize*, S. Alexander, Fellow of Lincoln (Melbourne); *Greek Testament* (jun.), W. Marsh, Exeter (Durham University); *Proz. Acc.*, S. A. Alexander, Trinity (S. Paul's); *Septuagint*

(sen.), H. J. Cohen, Jesus (Univ. Coll. London); *Procr. Acc.*, H. D. S. Sweetapple, Queen's; *Septuagint* (jun.), C. W. Dickinson, Non-Coll.; *Procr. Acc.*, R. W. Baker, Magdalen, R. G. Plumptre, Exeter (Winchester); *Lollian Essay*, O. M. Edwards, Balliol (Aberystwith and Glasgow); *Acc.*, J. C. Bailey, New (Haileybury), W. Waite, Balliol.

CLASSICAL MODERATIONS.—*Class 1*: S. A. Alexander, Trin. (S. Paul's), E. N. Bennett, Hertf. (Durham), G. T. Birch, Linc. (Wrexham), W. C. Bosanquet, New (Eton), E. G. Bowring, Hertf. (Jersey), H. Bull, Univ. (Chr. Hosp.), W. Busby, New (Winchester); E. K. Chambers, C. C. C. (Marlboro), F. D. P. Chaplin, Univ. (Harrow), F. H. Collier, Ch. Ch. (Westminster), A. C. M. Croome, Magd. (Wellington), A. A. David, Qu. (Exeter), J. N. Farquhar, Ch. Ch. (Aberdeen), R. H. Ferard, Ex. (Eton), C. M. Gillespie, Trin. (Edinburgh), W. J. Goodrich, Ball. (Charterhouse), H. L. Goudge, Univ. (Blackheath), W. A. Gray, Ball. (Aberdeen), H. S. Q. Henriques, Wore. (Manchester), A. E. Hillard, Ch. Ch. (Kingswood and Univ. Coll. London), R. Johnson, Jes. (Warwick), H. P. Lowe, Ch. Ch. (Westminster), J. A. MacKay, Ch. Ch. (Glasgow), C. E. Montague, Ball. (City of London), W. J. Morrell, Ball. (Tiverton), E. W. M. Oldridge-de-la-Hey, Univ. (Manchester), H. W. Orange, New (Winchester), A. B. Poynton, Ball. (Marlboro), G. C. Richards, Ball. (Rugby), F. S. Rossiter, Wadh. (Uppingham), G. I. Simey, Ball. (Rugby), D. A. Slater, Magd. (Broms-grove), J. F. R. Stainer, Magd. (Winchester), E. B. Titchener, Bras. (Malvern), R. B. Tollinton, Ball. (Leamington), B. G. Ussher, New (Marlboro), A. K. Watson, Ball. (Harrow), H. W. Wilson, Trin. (Durham), W. B. Wood, Wore. (Rugby), W. J. Woodhouse, Qu. (Selbergh).

Class 2: H. T. G. Alington, Magd., E. Anwyl, Or., J. R. Atkin, Magd., A. L. Aubin, Jes., J. M. Bastard, S. Joh., H. G. Belcher, Ex., E. J. Bidwell, Wadh., T. G. R. Blunt, Ch. Ch., T. P. Broadbent, Or., P. Broke, Mer., H. C. Burnett, Bras., H. W. Carlton, Linc., H. L. M. Cary, Or., R. B. Clark, S. Joh., H. B. Clarke, Wadh., J. R. Cooke, Wadh., E. W. Cornwall, Keb., F. J. K. Cross, New, W. M. Crowdy, Bras., A. H. Crowther, Jes., H. C. Cure, Hertf., C. S. Currie, Bras., G. R. Dale, Univ., W. G. de Burgh, Mer., E. W. M. de Jersey, New, A. Dews, Ball., G. F. Dugard, Jes., A. G. Essery, S. Joh., H. J. Essex, Jes., G. L. Evans, C. C. C., A. G. Every, Pemb., H. F. Fisher, Trin., F. Fletcher, Ball., K. B. D. Forbes, S. Joh., H. A. Francis, Keb., H. C. Garden, Bras., W. G. Griffiths, Jes., R. D. Grindley, Trin., R. C. Guy, Hertf., H. E. D. Hammond, C. C. C., E. C. Harpur, New, L. W. Harry, Bras., E. J. Harvey, C. C. C., E. Hill, Pemb., J. W. Hills, Ball., D. J. Hussey-Freke, Magd., J. C. Inglis, New, J. A. Johnston, Ball., F. H. Johnstone, Wadh., E. W. Jones, Bras., H. Kempson, Ch. Ch., I. Kent, New, G. Landon, Linc., J. M. Latham, C. C. C., S. W. Lovell, Linc., E. W. Lummis,

Wore., W. G. Max-Müller, Univ., E. G. Mayo Trin., P. B. Mellish, C. C. C., J. Mill, Trin., A. C. Moore, Qu., E. W. Moore, Ch. Ch., G. F. L. Mortimer, Ball., C. P. F. O'Dwyer, Pemb., A. A. Ogle, Keb., S. C. Parmiter, Or., W. R. W. Peel, Ball., E. H. Polchampton, Qu., H. T. Powell, Magd., J. M. Quicke, Hertf., L. Ragg, Ch. Ch., H. W. Rhodes, Wore., G. Richardson, S. Joh., J. G. Robinson, C. C. C., R. Robinson, Bras., E. St. Leger, New, J. Sankey, Jes., W. H. G. Southcomb, Ex., T. G. Spyers, Magd., W. Sterry, Mer., W. G. Stone, Ball., S. Swire, Ex., W. E. Teschemaker, Mer., W. R. Thomas, Qu., W. E. Thomson, Or., J. G. Thornton, Keb., C. W. Tweedy, Qu., A. Wade, All Soul's, F. W. Waldoek, Hertf., W. T. H. Walsh, S. Joh., H. Ward, C. C. C., L. H. White, C. C. C.

MERTON *Cl. Postm.*: V. L. Johnstone, Wellington, A. W. G. Aitken, Bedford; *Cl. Esh.*: D. MacK. Lamont, Aberdeen; *New Nat. Sci. Esh.*: A. Stewart, Eton; *LINCOLN Cl. Sch.*: W. P. H. Strange, S. Paul's, R. B. Maurice, Marlboro, A. H. Tollit, Magd. Coll. School, E. J. W. Houghton, Swansea; *Cl. Esh.*: H. C. Lipsett, Chr. Hosp., C. A. Pease, Clifton, W. A. Fox, Clifton; *Ch. Ch. Official Student*: W. Hobhouse (Hertf.), Eton; *JESUS Cl. Sch.*: R. C. Brown, Clergy Orphan Sch., H. E. A. Cotton, Sherborne, A. C. Stephens, Rugby, E. G. Wilkinson, Kingswood, T. E. Evans, Cowbridge, A. Rogers, Swansea; *Esh.*: A. F. Pollard, Felstead, J. R. Smart, Vica, Truro, C. E. Ind, Brecon, J. A. Thomas (Jes. Coll.), G. S. Davies, Rossall, A. C. Evans, Brecon, J. E. Jones, Llandovery, J. H. Pugh, Brecon, T. S. Roberts, Llanrwst; *PEMBROKE Cl. Sch.*: C. Field, J. E. Sugars, Manchester, T. I. Williams, Jersey; *Esh.*: C. S. Boyle, Guernsey; *KEBLE Cl. Sch.*: T. S. Peppin, Bath Coll., E. G. S. North, Blackheath; *Cl. Esh.*: R. A. Cholmeley (Keb.), Highgate, R. T. Jourdain, Haileybury; C. G. Spencer, Marlboro; *Hist. Sch.*: W. M. Childs, Portsmouth; *Hist. Esh.*: W. A. G. Etheridge (Keb.), Magd. Coll. Sch., H. Jordan, Cheltenham.

ANNOUNCEMENTS.

Merton: Two Classical Fellowships, value £200 per annum, tenable for 7 years, next October. Date of examination not yet fixed.

Beasenose: Tuesday, June 28, and following days. Hulme Exhibition in Modern History, £80 for 1 year. Candidates to be under 20 on July 7, to need assistance, and to apply by letter to the Principal not later than June 1.

Trinity and Wadham Scholarships: Examination begins Thursday, November 24, at 9.30 A.M. Four Scholarships at each college, value £80, and (possibly) Exhibitions at either college for deserving candidates. Optional papers will be set in Mathematics, French and German. Candidates to be under 19 on the day of election, and to call on the President or Warden at 5 P.M. on November 23.

CAMBRIDGE.

UNIVERSITY SCHOLARSHIPS. — *Bell* (Classical): E. Abbott, Caius (S. Paul's), H. W. Anden, Christ's (Shrewsbury), E. E. Sikes, S. John's (Aldenharn), H. B. Walters, King's (Eton); *Abbott* (Math.): G. F. Emery, Trinity (Ely), W. Hall, King's (Rossall); *Barnes* (Math.): G. T. Walker, Trinity (S. Paul's); *Lightfoot* (History): R. C. Wilton, S. Catherine's.

UNIVERSITY PRIZES — *Reading Prizes*: L. G. B. J. Ford, King's (Repton), H. E. Sherlock, Selwyn (Lancing); *Hulstian Essay* ('86): J. C. Nicbl, Trin. Hall (Birmingham).

COLLEGE SCHOLARSHIPS. — *Clare*: (Math. Sch.) J. G. Greenhalgh, Manchester, H. G. A. Leveson, Wren and Gurney, P. Boyd, Uppingham; (Cl. Sch.) G. A.

Purton, Shrewsbury, F. de W. Lushington, Sutton Valence; (Nat. Sci. Sch.) E. S. Hayward, Weymouth, A. E. Lee, Merchant Taylors'; *Trinity Hall*: (Math. Sch.) G. P. Turnbull, Isle of Man; (Cl. Sch.) H. Sutthery, Oundle, D. Black, Ely, F. Ayers, Perse School, H. C. Harvey, Clifton, H. A. Nicolas, Tonbridge; *S. Catherine's*: (Sch.) W. E. Orrey, Isle of Man, E. P. Schjott, Cranbrook, H. Sutthery, Oundle, H. K. Gracey, City of London, M. G. V. Cole, Brentwood, E. D. Lawson, Dedham, J. Mackintosh, Newcastle (Staff.); *Magdalene*: (Cl. Sch.) W. F. Baldoek, Ipswich; (Milner Sch.) — Robinson, Heversham.

The Classical Review

JULY 1887.

FRAGMENTA HERCULANENSIA.

Fragmenta Herculanensia: A descriptive catalogue of the Oxford copies of the Herculanæan rolls, together with the texts of several papyri, accompanied by facsimiles. Edited, with introduction and notes, by WALTER SCOTT, M.A., Fellow of Merton College, Oxford. Clarendon Press, 1885. 21s.

THE author of this volume was called away from England in the winter of 1884-5 to succeed Dr. Badham in the chair of Classics at Sydney, Australia, leaving behind him a brilliant reputation in Oxford for so young a man. The work before us he left just ready for the press; nor has it lost anything from the absence of the author. The printing is worthy of the Clarendon, and Mr. Wallace M. Lindsay appears to have corrected the proof-sheets with scrupulous care.

Most English scholars are aware of the laborious volumes of papyri which have slowly proceeded from the Naples press, or have read with interest the contributions to this study made by Professor Comparetti of Florence, or by Professor Gomperz of Vienna, of whom the latter may be said to have made this province especially his own. It will, however, be a surprise to many readers to learn that the first work done for the study of the Herculanæan rolls was done by an English scholar, assisted by English patrons; and that the earliest attempt to estimate their value is to be found in the *Edinburgh* and *Quarterly Reviews* of 1810. It may surprise them yet more to read that George IV. (when Prince of Wales) and afterwards Sir Humphry Davy were among the principal Englishmen who interested themselves in the matter; it will surprise them most of all to find that, although only eight original rolls are now in England and the rest at Naples, and although nowhere except at Naples, in the *Officina dei Papiri*, is there any one with the skill to unroll these charred relics, yet the best copies of the

papyrus-texts in existence are in the Bodleian.

These copies were made at Naples in 1802-1806 by the Rev. John Hayter, chaplain to the Prince of Wales. His work was interrupted by the French invasion in 1806; and in 1809 he returned to England, bringing with him all the lead-pencil facsimiles made by himself, besides eighteen made before his arrival in Italy; the whole collection was presented by the Prince to the University of Oxford, and deposited in the Bodleian in 1810. Since that time the Italian scholars have gone on unrolling and deciphering fresh papyri, and making independent copies of those already deciphered by Hayter. Small blame attaches to them if, in a task like this, their results have been given to the world by slow degrees: it is a more serious fault that the Naples texts are not distinguished by that accuracy which is the primary obligation of the specialist, seeing that his results have pretty much to be taken for granted by more general students.

An effort was made by the University in 1824 to publish the Bodleian facsimiles. In that year appeared *Herculanensium Voluminum, Pars I.*, and in 1825 a *Pars II.*, the two volumes merely containing lithographs of seven of the lead-pencil copies. The editor is not known; *Pars I.* contains a brief preface and a meagre catalogue of the Bodleian copies. But no apparatus criticus, still less any commentary, accompanied the texts, and no attempt was made to restore readings, or discover even the sequence of pages. Since then the bulk of the collection lay in the Bodleian, entombed in an oblivion almost as complete as befell their originals at Herculaneum, until in 1863 they were examined by Professor Gomperz. Their value is due to the fact that many of the frail originals have suffered damage since Hayter and his assistants made their copies, so that the Naples texts are often less com-

plete. Of course in the case of the rolls that have been opened since 1806, we must start with the Naples edition, and verify it by collation with the originals, if still existing. But the text of the remainder can only be settled by a comparison of these three data—the Bodleian copies, the Naples edition, and the original papyri.

Perhaps the neglect which these documents have suffered at the hands of English scholars was a sort of reaction from the curiosity aroused by their first discovery. When it turned out that these papyri, unrolled and read at so heavy a cost of time and money, contained chiefly fragments of second-rate Epicurean philosophy, it was perhaps pardonable if disappointment bred indifference. It must also be freely allowed that the Herculanean rolls cannot compare in interest with the papyri from Fayûm of a not much later date, which are uninjured by fire, and, although mere fragments, are fragments from the priceless stores of Alexandrian learning.¹ Nevertheless, it is no small privilege to be admitted into the library of Philodemus, the contemporary of Cicero (*In Pis.* 28-9, *De Fin.* ii. 35), to which all the Herculanean rolls apparently belonged. They are among the earliest Greek MSS. in existence, and of high interest on palaeographical grounds. And uninviting as the scholastic subtleties of Epicurean theology may seem, the students of the *De Natura Deorum*, bk. i., have been very grateful for the help contributed from this source to the interpretation of some of the most obscure passages in Cicero (see Mr. J. B. Mayor, *De N. D.*, vol. i., pp. xlii. foll.). The biographical rolls, including letters of Epicurus and his friends—and indeed any considerable fragments of Epicurus' own works—cannot fail to add to our knowledge. It may also be hoped that in the yet unopened rolls, or in the unpublished texts of those already opened, or again in some of the treatises of Philodemus and others on the subject of poetry and rhetoric, there may yet be gleaned some precious fragments of lost Greek literature.

The scope and contents of Mr. Scott's work will be best set forth in his own words:—'In the present volume are contained: I. A catalogue of the Oxford facsimiles of the Herculanean rolls, showing what has hitherto been done, and what still remains to be done, towards utilising the materials contained in

the collection. The catalogue consists of two parts. In the first part, all the Oxford facsimiles are given in the order in which they occur in the seven bound volumes of the Oxford collection. . . . In the second part, certain papyri, known to form parts of the same work, or clearly connected by the similarity of their contents, are grouped together. Those of the Oxford facsimiles included in this group are given in both parts, with a reference from the first part to the second.' The sequence of the Oxford copies has been so utterly disarranged, that the work here done by Mr. Scott will save future students a vast amount of trouble. He has brought Hayter's copies into relation with the Naples texts, citing in each case the literature which has gathered round each papyrus. None but those who have gone over the same ground are qualified to judge with authority of this part of the work; but one may be permitted to admire the ingenious and painstaking labour which is evinced on every page. This catalogue will be an indispensable handbook for all scholars who shall attempt the study of the Herculanean papyri.

The restoration of a tolerably complete and certain text is rendered in many cases possible by several important circumstances. Sometimes the charred rolls have been accidentally broken into two halves, which have been unrolled independently of each other; so that pages which at first were thought to be mutilated can be completed as soon as scholars (led by external as well as internal evidence) have brought the two portions together again. Something has been already said of the value of the Oxford copies as supplementing and often correcting the Italian texts. But more important help is due to the fact that Philodemus appears to have accumulated in his *capsae* duplicate copies of his own works; so that repeatedly it is found that two different rolls have identical contents, and mutually complete their readings. Moreover, the method of composition adopted by these later philosophers (including assuredly Cicero himself), of incorporating whole passages of previous writers into their own treatises, is a further source of assistance. Such wholesale plagiarism is only second to the existence of duplicate MSS. as a help to the task of restoration.² Examples of all these methods

¹ Our readers are doubtless familiar with the interesting lecture of Dr. Hartel, 'Ueber die Griechischen Papyri Erzherzog Rainer' (Wien, 1886).

² It will be remembered how Jacob Bernays disengaged five important 'excerpta' from Theophrastus, *Περὶ ἐλαίας*, which are incorporated by Porphyrius in his treatise *De Abstinentia* (*Theophrastos' Schrift über Frömmigkeit*, Berlin, 1886).

of restoration are given in Parts II. and III. of the volume.

Professor Scott has printed 'A restored text of two rolls (pap. 157-152 and 26), the Naples facsimiles of which have already been published, the first in the *Collectio Prior*, and the second in the *Collectio Altera*. The Oxford facsimiles have been reproduced to accompany the text. . . . ' Also, 'the text of three of the best preserved rolls in the Oxford collection, not hitherto published in any form,—pap. 19-698, 1,013, and 862. . . . The texts here given are in all cases based on a collation of the Oxford facsimiles, the Naples (published or unpublished) facsimiles, and the originals' (at Naples). One of the texts here given is entitled *Φιλοδήμου περὶ θεῶν διαγωγῆς*, the interpretation of which had already been attempted by Mr. Scott in the *Journal of Philology*, xii. p. 245. Another is *Φιλοδήμου περὶ θεῶν α*. A third is anonymous, but is conjectured to be by Philodemus, and is entitled provisionally by the editor *Περὶ αἰσθήσεως*.

An Appendix (Part IV.) gives to the world, for the first time, impressions of copper-plates of some of Hayter's facsimiles, prepared before 1813 under Hayter's own direction, for the publication then contemplated by the University. "These engraved plates were completely forgotten, and have only been rediscovered in the present year" (p. 5).

Mr. Scott is careful to insist on the amount of work that yet remains to be done for the editing of the Herculanean texts. The first step to be taken is the publication of the Bodleian copies. 'As a preparation for the restoration of the texts, it is essential that the more important of the Oxford facsimiles hitherto unpublished should be reproduced . . . and issued in a form generally accessible," (p. 11). There are also in England, yet unopened, eight rolls (three at Oxford, one at Windsor, four in the British Museum). These precious relics should be placed in the skilful hands of the Naples operators and unrolled, and their contents given as early as possible to the world. One of the Bodleian rolls (a fourth) was in 1883 sent under Mr. Scott's charge to Naples and was unrolled, but without result; to his disappointment, it proved to be charred beyond recovery. When these several steps have been taken, it will next remain to revise the texts by a collation of the originals (when extant) with the Naples copies and (where possible) with the Oxford facsimiles. Then, and not till then, shall we have a final text of the fragments. At

present the student of Greek philosophy or philology will do well to use great caution in employing the unrevised texts. How dangerous it is to take for granted the accuracy of the texts hitherto published, may be seen by two examples. A 'geographical fragment' in Ionic Greek is published by Herscher at the end of the 'Teubner' text of Aelian. It purports to have been deciphered from a Herculanean papyrus by a German named Sickler in 1817. The fragment (useless in itself) was in all probability forged by Sickler as a bait to deceive the English authorities, and on the strength of it he was actually employed to operate on the rolls then in England under the superintendence of a Parliamentary Committee. The only results of his performance were the utter destruction of seven rolls, and the expenditure of £1,200 (p. 6, 7). Our other example shall be the title of Pap. 157-152 given by the Naples editors as *Φιλοδήμου περὶ τῆς τῶν θεῶν εὐστοχουμένης διαγωγῆς κατὰ Ζήνωνα*, which is accepted as really from the MS. in Zeller's *History of Philosophy*, and also by Mr. J. B. Mayor, in his edition of the *De Natura Deorum*. 'Of this,' says Mr. Scott (p. 95), '*Φιλοδήμου περὶ* is certainly, and *διαγωγῆς* probably, right: and there must have been some mention of the gods. The rest is due, like much else, to the imagination of the Naples editor.' The fact is, it is too much to expect the text of documents like these (and the same thing has been found true of coins and marbles) to be constituted by a single effort. What a long and distinguished succession of scholars has worked at the text of the Greek dramatists, and of the New Testament! And yet even there the text is not yet convincingly settled. Much more is there need of caution and patience in dealing with documents so difficult to recover, so utterly disarranged, so often mutilated and obscure; scholar after scholar must contribute his share of labour—

ἄλλος παρ' ἄλλου διαδοχαῖς πληρούμενοι.

There will be room for only one or two remarks upon certain details.

To the peculiarities tabulated on pp. 15, 16, may be added the form *εἶδαν* (p. 251), well known to Greek Testament students; again, *παρασκευάζειν* (p. 232) needs no correction, being a genuine Greek form (see Meisterhans, *Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften*, p. 39), such doubling of Σ being not uncommon.

Some of the forms mentioned on pp. 15,

16, e.g. *πώρρω* and *νωήσεων* would not be likely to occur in inscriptions earlier than 100 A.D. But *ει* for *ι* and *vice versa* is a common interchange from 100 B.C. onwards. The peculiar substitution of *ηα* for *εια* in words like *ἐπεμέληα*, *εὐσέβηα*, which became extremely common in Augustan times (*circa* B.C. 35-A.D. 50) all through Greece, and afterwards entirely ceased, has been often accounted for by the influence of the Latin *ē* (in *Medēa*, &c.), upon Greek orthography: see Meisterhans, p. 23. I have sought in vain for an instance of this kind in Mr. Scott's papyri (*ἄπρηρον* for *ἄπειρον*, p. 15, is not exactly typical). This may confirm the opinion that they belong to the age of Cicero rather than of Augustus. Forms like *ἐγβάλλειν*, *ἐγλογῆς*, *ἄμ μή, μέγ γάρ* are interesting survivals of older Greek spelling, such as meet us occasionally in the MSS. of the New Testament; but the more frequent avoidance of such assimilations, e.g. *ἐγκατέλπειν*, *ἀναγκαῖος*, *ἔργειον* (= *ἔγγιον*), exemplifies a tendency which becomes increasingly noticeable in the last two centuries B.C. Mr. Gow, in the *Journal of Philology* (vii. 1883, p. 278), has already called attention to the mixed employment in these papyri of the alphabetical ciphers and of the initial or 'Attic' numeral system. The stichometric marks are all but invariably given by means of 'initial' notation; indeed, the only exception appears to be

that mentioned by Mr. Scott on p. 41, which is an odd combination of both systems (pap. 1414). On pp. 29, 30, Mr. Scott is surely right in reading (in what seems to be the conclusion of a lecture by Philodemus) *καὶ τῆς καλῆς Μ(ι)λήτου μὴ ἀποστάντι διαπαντός Εἰρηναίῳ*, and in translating 'Irenaeus, who has never abandoned fair Miletus.' Why, however, he should conjecture the phrase 'to abandon fair Miletus' to have been a proverb is not so clear. Why not suppose Irenaeus to be a philosophic friend of the lecturer, whose home was at Miletus and who had declined a pressing invitation to Italy? The name *Εἰρηναῖος* and its cognates occur often in that neighbourhood; e.g. *C.I.G.* 2885 (Miletus), *Εἰρηνίας*, LeBas-Waddington, *Asie* 1568 bis (Miletus); *Εἰρηνίας* (or *Εἰρηνίος*?) in the Milesian award about Messene (Dittenberger, *Sylloge*, 240); *Εἰρηνίος* (*sic*) in the *Hellenic Journal*, 1886, p. 144 (Samos); and the Christian Father Irenaeus is another instance connecting the name (though not uncommon elsewhere, e.g. at Athens) with Ionia. Mr. Scott has very properly adopted Professor Gomperz's system of brackets and other signs to indicate doubtful or restored letters and words; it is a pity, however, that this system is quite different from the method which has been so admirably devised by the Berlin editors of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Atticarum*.

E. L. HICKS.

THE OXFORD AVIANUS.

The fables of AVIANUS edited, with prolegomena, critical apparatus, commentary, excursus, and index by ROBINSON ELLIS, M.A., LL.D., Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford, University Reader in Latin. Oxford at the Clarendon Press. 1887. 8vo. pp. xlv, 151. 8s. 6d.

The publication in 1883 of Mr. Rutherford's *Bobrius* determined the present edition of *Avianus*.

For several years Mr. Ellis, in the study of Maximianus and Orientius, has been led to the neglected writers of the decline. He justly complains that interpretation has not kept pace with criticism even in Germany. 'No adequate edition of Ammianus exists.' With due gratitude to the excellent editors Lindénbrog and the two De Valois (to say nothing of James Gronov), we must allow that the monographs in which Hertz and

others have analysed the mosaic of Ammianus, need condensation in one exhaustive commentary, and that current texts may gain by the aid of Madvig and other recent critics.

Ellis has but one predecessor as an interpreter of Avianus, Hendrik Cannegieter (24 Febr. 1691—21 Aug. 1770). He is not, I think, ungenerous, when he says:

Judged by modern standards, Cannegieter performed his task only tolerably well. His notes are cumbrous and loaded with useless citations, as well as unnecessary or improbable conjectures.

Yet, having carefully studied Cannegieter's book from the first page to the last, I wish to say a word on his behalf. Avianus was his first publication, and he continued to publish for thirty-five years after its appearance. I learn from the Dutch Biographical

Dictionary of Van der Aa that thirty years ago his papers, including additions to his published works, were in the hands of the family Burghgraaf at Franeker. Will some Dutch correspondent make inquiries on the spot?

Ellis quotes the criticisms of Wopkens, and his reply to Cannegieter's defence, and also the notes of that master of Latin poetry, Fr. Guyet.¹ In the same volume with the two latter pieces (Misc. obs. crit. viii, Amst. 1737, pp. 1-20) appeared Cannegieter's defence, where he points out e.g. that fab. 7 4 and fab. 25 6 both end with the words *ricribus ora trahens*. These notes have apparently escaped Ellis. Indeed I have found in the older commentary not a few illustrations which I had searched for in vain in the new; some of these I give below, marked with an asterisk. Cannegieter was a grateful disciple of the great Perizonius (see p. 159 'cuius me disciplinis formatum esse, in prima felicitatis parte pono, nec merita obliviscar unquam') and bequeathed his interest in the later Latin to his pupils, the elder and younger Arntzenius, as may be seen in their successive prefaces. His own preface to Avianus displays to the life the busy hive of that Dutch school, which it is now the fashion to disparage, but which has rendered lasting service to accurate scholarship.

In his Prolegomena Ellis treats of the age of Avianus (or Avienus, for he identifies him with one of the company in Macr.), the prosody of the fables, diction and syntax, the mss.

With many recent critics he holds that the Theodosius of the dedication is the author Macrobius, and proves (as Cannegieter had done most convincingly) that he cannot have been either of the emperors Theodosius. So far Ellis is on solid ground. Going on, he is wise beyond what is written. For I cannot think that Ausonius (Grat. Act. § 41 *habes ergo consiliatorem et metuis proditorem*) alludes to fab. 26 11 12:

*nam quamvis rectis constet sententia verbis,
suspectam hanc rabidus consiliator habet;*

or that where Symmachus complains (ep. I 101) of the difficulty of congratulating a consul's appointment while lamenting a brother's death (*duae mihi simul personae*

¹ Ellis nowhere states where these are to be found. They are among the *adversaria* of Jo. Scheffer of Strassburg (who derived them from Nic. Heins) and fill pp. 423-6 of the volume cited. I was put on the right scent by Fabricius-Ernesti Bibl. Lat. Teuffel makes no mention of Guyet.

dispare offeruntur. qui fieri potest ut os unum contrariis adfectionibus induamus?) he has in mind the traveller blowing hot and cold (fab. 29 22 *tam diversa duo qui simul ora ferat*). Indeed the language of Symmachus more nearly resembles St. James 3 9-12. Again, when Ellis, after Unrein, makes Macrobius (Comm. I 2 § 7 *fabulae, quarum nomen indicat falsi professionem*, cl. §§ 9, 10) allude to the words in our fabulist's dedication *fabularum textus occurrit, quod in his urbane concepta falsitas deceat et non incumbat necessitas veritatis*, I doubt whether Clinton would have built a chronological argument on such a foundation. To me both writers suggest the school definition of *μῦθος*, *fabula*, *λόγος ψευδῆς εἰκονίζων ἀλήθειαν* (Aphthon. progymn. 1), *fabula est, in qua nec verae nec veri similes res continentur* (Cic. inv. I § 27. cf. Philostr. in Ellis p. 50).

With regard to sins of prosody Avianus is here successfully cleared from not a few. Possibly he allowed a syllable, short by position, at the end of the first half of the pentameter; but no great violence need be done in order to correct the ten examples which occur. Of other faults we may get rid of *velis* in one place 23 10 (Lachmann's conjecture is wrongly given on p. xxiv.) by reading:

sive deum, busti seu decus esse velis.

The chapter on the diction and syntax of Avianus will be of service to grammarians and lexicographers. Of mss. eleven have been collated throughout by the editor (one Paris, three Oxford, two Peterhouse, four British Museum, one Trèves, one St. Gallen fragment) and others examined. The Gale ms. was collated by Munro for Bährens. Various readings are given at the foot of the page. A strict adherence to Cobet's rules might perhaps have lightened the margin so far as to make room for *auctores et imitatores*, which a sound tradition (as e.g. in Schenkl's Calpurnius) now places immediately under the text. In the commentary Bodleian mss. of a Greek paraphrase are cited.

I add a few illustrations.

P. 1 l. 2 *in utroque litterarum genere*. Add to my note on Iuv. xv 110 Sidon. c. 25 (= 23 p. 582 Baret) 236 *commercium duplicis loquellae*. Ov. a. a. ii 122 *linguas...duas*. Egger Hist. de la Critique 540.

Fab. 2 13 *exosae* pass. the passage of Macrobius is cited again on 33 6; also, with this of Avianus, and six other examples, by Georges, whose lexicon would, if consulted,

have relieved this commentary of much unnecessary repetition. Georges has not the following *Liberat. breviar.* 24. *Clem. recogn.* I 5.

Fab. 3 4 *emonuisse* inserted in text by conjecture (*codd. prae-*). When we remember that lexicons are compiled, sometimes without verification, from indexes, and that often (*e.g.* in this book) the index gives no hint that the word lacks ms. authority, it becomes evident that only absolute certainty, proved by general acceptance, should entitle conjectural ἀπαξ λεγόμενα to a place in the text. So below, 10 5, *praeſlant* (for *praeſtant* of *codd.*, *perſlant* Ashb.), though *praeſtant* is excellently expounded in the note. *ib.* note on ver. 3 'Prud.' add 'perist.'

Fab. 3 11 12

*nam stultum nimis est, cum tu pravissima
temptes,
alterius censor si vitiosa notes.*

I agree with Wopkens in taking this 'as a general reflexion' (the Clarendon printers insist on *et*, 'reflection'). In the note, *not* has fallen out between *would* and *then*.

Fab. 4 1 Cannegieter excellently defends *ad sidera* cl. 15 *praesentia numina*. Cf. fab. 8 5 6.

Fab. 4 2 *apud magnum...Iovem* would be more natural.

Fab. 4 13 *requiescere membra* transitive also Ign. Trall. 12.

Fab. 6 7 *nec se iactat cessisse* 'a little forced for *et se non cessisse iactat*.' See Drakenb. on Liv. XXXII 10 § 6. Fabri on Liv. XXII 22 § 4. Ov. am. I 6 72. Plin. ep. III 14 § 7. Kühner lat. Gr. II 657.

Fab. 8. Here, as throughout, we crave a larger comparison of fables and proverbs. Even a select bibliography of the later literature of ancient fable would have been acceptable. At any rate Leutsch's note should have been cited (*Paroem.* II 441-2, *Apostol.* VIII 43 ἡ κάμηλος ἐπιθυμήσασα κεράτων καὶ τὰ ὄτα προσάπώλεσεν). Add schol. Luc. Icarom. 10 (I see that Luc. himself is cited on ver. 5). The German and Dutch lexicons of proverbs (by Wander and Harrebomée) are well worth study.

Fab. 9 5 I agree with Guyet that the ms. *dumque per inceptum vario sermone feruntur* need not be altered, *e.g.* with Cannegieter, Lachmann, Fröhner, Bährens into *incertum*, or with Ellis into *insaeptum* ('unenclosed,' cited by Georges from Paulus Festi). A glance at Mühlmann's article 'inceptum' will shew that the words may mean 'pursue their plan,' 'carry out their enterprise.'

Fab. 10 11 *quid mirum?* From the fate

of this phrase in the hands of index-makers we may learn a salutary lesson. Cannegieter's index generally gives phrases, not single words, but here he, as well as Ellis, has *quid* and *mirum* as two separate articles. Even Forcellini supplies only two examples, the hackneyed one from Horace, and one from Ovid. Of the following references I had registered only those from Seneca and Tertullian; the rest I have gathered by the aid of indexes, mostly of the Delphin type, necessitating the examination of every example of *mirum*. I learnt that the majority of Latin writers eschew the phrase, and that *nec mirum* is much more usual. Cic. Verr. v § 6. de domo § 1 *quare quid est mirum, si...?* Prop. IV (v) 4 39 and 41. Ov. her. 15 85. (Paris Oenonae 69). fasti VI 289. Pont. III 4 63. Manil. IV 886. Curt. v 5 § 12. x 1 § 33 (both q. m. est). Cf. IV 11 § 4 *ecquid m. est, si...?* Sen. de ira II 31 § 4 (q. m. est). prov. 4 § 12. Stat. s. II 1 175. v 3 162. Tert. adv. Marc. II 2 p. m. Mamertin. genethl. Maxim. 14 f. q. *enim m. si...?* Inc. panegy. Constantio Caes. 6 q. *erit m., si...?* Auson. epitaph. her. 9 4.

Fab. 11 4 (*de duabus ollis*)

*sed diversa duas ars et natura creavit,
aere prior fusa est, altera facta luto.*

It occurred to me that *ficta* was required in opposition to *fusa*, before I saw that *ficta* has equal authority with *facta* and is read by Bährens. See Justin 36. 4. 4 (of Attalus) *ab hoc studio aerariae artis fabricae se tradit cerisque fingendis et aere fundendo procu- dendoque oblectatur*.

Fab. 11 7

*ne tamen elisam confringeret aerea testa,
iurabat solidam longius ire viam.*

The vast majority of mss. read *testam*, which is required by the opposition to *aerea (olla)*. I do not understand *solidam viam*, whereas the ms. *solitam* is perfectly simple: 'swore to go on, as it had gone, at a distance'; 'to give it a wide berth.'

Fab. 12 1

rusticus impresso molitus vomere terram.

Cf. * Verg. g. I 494

agricola incurvo terram molitus aratro.

Fab. 12. In the note on ver. 9 (p. 72)

The verb *prodere* in the sense of handing on, transmitting, is not uncommon, especially with *memoriae* or *litteris*, each of which is found in Vegetius (III 1, III 26).

Invert the order and read Veg. III praef. (p. 63 15 Lang) *litteris*. III 26 *memoriae*.

(Another erratum p. xxxvi l. ult. for x read IX).

Fab. 13 4

Cinyphii ductor qui gregis esse solet.

Cf. * anth. Lat. 117 6 R. *ducit Cinyphii lactea dona gregis.*

Fab. 13 5 *longa de valle* is satisfactorily explained in the note. I see no place for the conjecture *longum* (*locutus*).

Fab. 14 11 *turpissima.*

From * Ennius (not Cicero, as Cannegieter says) Sat. 45 Vahlen (in Cic. n. d. i § 97, Seren. Sammon. 825) *simia quam similis turpissima bestia nobis.*

Fab. 15 1 2

Threiciam volucrem fertur Iunonius ales communi sociam detinuisse cibo.

The ms. *continuisse* gives a very good sense and has an exact parallel in 29 5 6

hunc nemorum custos fertur miseratus in antro

exceptum Satyrus continuisse suo.

Fab. 15 11 'The conjecture *in numerum* is Cannegieter's, but is wholly needless.

Fab. 16 9 10

se quoque tam vasto rectam non sistere trunco, ast illam tenui cortice ferre minas.

The oak is speaking in the fable of the oak and the reed.

I believe I have restored intelligibility to this line by reading *rectam non sistere* for *necdum* (*rectum* C) *consistere* of MSS. The objection is not to *necdum* being used for *nondum*,... but to its being the exact reverse of what we should expect, *non iam*: for all attempts to force the meaning of 'not yet' into the passage are futile.

I hope not. 'Even she, with so mighty a bole, did not yet stand firm, but the reed with its slender bark braved the storm.' Even yet, adding year by year to her solid strength, she could not hold her ground. *Non iam*, as it seems to me, would be far weaker.

Fab. 17 (in the 9th line of Babr. 1 p. 81 *διαστὰς* is misprinted *διαοράς*).

Fab. 17 3 4

tum pavidis audax cupiens succurrere tigris verbere commoto iussit adesse minax.

Neither Ellis nor Fröhner nor Bährens state which MSS. have *adesse*, presumably all but three: I am glad to see that Bährens keeps the received *commotas...minas*, 'lashes herself into a rage.'

Fab. 18 5 in the note (p. 83, also pp. 89, 105, 128) Reifferscheid's name is spelt with a *y*.

Fab. 19 3 4

indignum referens dumis certamen haberi, quos meritis nullus consociaret honor.

Wopkens has sufficiently supported *cunctis*; *dumis* after the *dumos* of ver. 1, seems to me very flat. Like Cannegieter, Schenkl, Bährens, and Ellis himself, I prefer *meriti*.

Fab. 20 5 6 (the little fish begging to be allowed to grow, till he would be worth catching).

'*parce, precor,*' *supplex lacrimis ita dixit obortis,*

'*nam quanta ex nostro corpore dona feres?*'

dona Lachmann for *damna* of MSS. ... Wopkens' view that *ex nostro corpore* = 'from the loss of my body,' i.e. by giving me up and restoring me to freedom, is harsh, but not impossible.

I agree with Wopkens; *damna* ('damage by returning me to the sea') seems to me far more effective than the *lucra* of the older editors, the *dona* of Lachmann, Fröhner, Bährens, Ellis; 'I ask you to make a sacrifice, but how small a one.'

Fab. 20 12

pinguior ad calamum sponte recurro tuum.

sponte an exaggeration as absurd as the springing tears of the fish in 3.

Yet not beyond the capacity of court flatterers Iuv. iv 69 *ipse capi voluit.*

Fab. 20 13 14

ille nefas captum referens absolvere piscem, difficiles queritur cassibus esse vices.

All MSS. *casibus* which Fröhner changes to *cassibus*. I follow the learned editor in holding this to be true; and it is recommended by its simplicity. Yet Av. *may* mean merely that accidents are variable and difficult to count upon.

Bährens also reads *cassibus*, and Cannegieter cites one MS. for it. Yet ingenious as it is, I hold it certainly to be wrong; throughout the fable angling, not netting, is spoken of.

Fab. 21 5

sed vox implumes turbavit, acredula, nidos.

MSS. have *credula*, '*acredula scripsi.*' The only scruple which this specious conjecture leaves in my mind, is that the vocative is not sufficiently indicated by the context. Cf. Georges s.v. *acredula* and * Claud. iii cons. Hon. praef. 5 *protinus implumes convertit ad aethera nidos.*

Fab. 22 5-8

his sese medium Titan, scrutatus utrumque optulit, et precibus cum peteretur, ait,

'*praestant di facilis, quae namque rogaverit unus, protinus haec alter congeminata feret.*'

MSS. have *ut peteretur*, with the exception of one, whose first hand wrote *conferetur*, from which Ellis has restored, as it seems to me with certainty, *quom peteretur*. In verse 7 the mss. read *prestandi facilis* (one *praestabit facilis*). Fröhner reads *praestandi facilis*, and Bährens *praestandist facilis*, but this seems very weak, for 'ready to give.' *Praestant di faciles*, on the other hand, makes excellent sense. See my note on *Iuv. x 8 di faciles*.

When a child I read in a magazine a story, which I cannot trace, but which I believe comes from some great mine of folklore and illustrates this fable. A fisherman, bringing a fine fish to court, was only admitted by the porter on promising to share with him its price. The king bid him name his own terms. 'Fifty stripes.' When 25 had been administered, the fisherman cried: 'Hold, I have a partner. He has a right to the remaining half.' 'Where can a second fool like you be found?' 'At your own gate.'

Fab. 22 19 *proventis*. 'The neuter *proventum* is rather rare.' So far as I know this is the only example.

Fab. 23 1 2

*venditor insignem referens de marmore Bacchum
expositum pretio fecerat esse deum.*

May not *referens* mean 'bringing home'? it is nowhere said that the salesman was himself the artist. *De marmore* Verg. *georg. iii 13*. In ver. 2 the rhythm forbids the construction '*fecerat expositum esse*.' Rather 'Had set it out for sale and made of it a god.' Cf. *Iuv. x 365-6 nos te, nos facimus, Fortuna, deum*. With the whole fable cf. * *Hor. s. 1 8 1-3*:

*olim truncus eram ficulneus, inutile lignum,
cum faber, incertus scammum faceretne Priu-
pum,
maluit esse deum. deus inde ego.*

More in Cannegieter.

Fab. 23 9

et me (seu) defunctis seu malis tradere divis.

See Kühner's *lat. Gr.* § 220 4 n. 3.

Fab. 23 11 12

*subdita namque tibi est magni reverentia sacri,
atque eadem retines funera nostra manu.*

For *sacri* mss. have *fati* or *facti*. The former is unobjectionable. Nor is *nequitiae*, the reading of some mss. for *namque tibi*, indefensible. 'For to thee (or to villainy, to

sordid avarice) is made subject the worship of a mighty destiny,' i.e. 'whether the marble be destined to receive worship as a god.' Cf. * *Tert. apol. 12 quantum autem de simulacris ipsis, nihil amplius deprehendo, quam materias (or matres) sorores esse vasculorum instrumentorumque communium vel ex isdem vasculis et instrumentis quasi fatum consecratione mutantes, licentia artis transfigurante et quidem contumeliosissime*. Add *Minuc. 23 § 9*. *Athenag. 26 p. 30^b*.

Fab. 24 4 *edita continuo fronte sepulchra vident*. MS. *forte* is perfectly simple. 'Chance straightway to espy a lofty tomb.' The archaism *frons* masc. should not be ascribed to Avianus without necessity. Cannegieter well refers on this fable (the Hunter and the Lion) to works of art representing Hercules and the Nemean lion. Strange to say, no one seems to have remembered the famous verses of Xenophanes (fr. 6 Mullach) 'if oxen or lions had hands or could paint as men etc.' cf. *Epicharmus in DL. iii 16*. *Cic. n.d. i §§ 76 77*.

Fab. 25 8 '*ima petit*, a Macrobian expression.' See *Aen. ix 119 120 aequora rostris ima petunt*. *Luc. iv 127 ima petit quidquid pendebat aquarum*.

Fab. 26 (pp. xii and 99).

The valuable Latin Glossary 4, 626 in Sir Thomas Phillipps' library at Cheltenham contains an extract from Avianus' version of this fable: *Citisus est herba de qua Avianus florentem citisum carpe*.

The passage meant is verse 5 *sed cytisi croceum per prata virentia florem*. The author of the gloss was evidently thinking rather of Verg. *ecl. 1 78 florentem cytisum et salices carpetis amaras*, which seems to have been in the thoughts of Avianus also, as he continues *et glaucas salices*. *Florentem cytisum* again Verg. *ecl. 2 64*.

Fab. 28 1 *vincla recusanti*. From *Aen. vii 15 16*

*iracque leonum
vincla recusantum.*

Fab. 29 14 *silvarum referens optima*.

From *Iuv. i 135 optima silvarum*.

Fab. 22 Freund and his followers (Riddle-White and Lewis-Short) state that the *o* in *duo* is found long only once (in Ausonius). Georges has no example. Ellis quotes three passages of Prudentius.

Fab. 30 7 Many additional examples of *praedictus* in the sense of 'aforesaid,' 'above,' will be found in Velleius.

Fab. 31 7 *tunc indignantem lasor sermone fatigans*. The ms. *insto* will stand, 'fair,' 'deserved.'

Fab. 34 3 Ellis, after Cannegieter, cites *confectus senio* from Valerius Maximus; lexx. add Ennius and Cicero.

Fab. 34 5 6

*solibus ereptos homini formica labores
distulit et brevibus condidit ante cavis.*

An exact parallel in Aug. enarr. in ps. 36 serm. 2 § 11 *quemadmodum formica abscondit in cavernosis penetralibus labores aestatis.*

Fab. 36 1 *pulcher et intacta vitulus cervice resultans.* Cf. * Verg. georg. iv 540 *intacta totidem cervice iuvencas.*

Fab. 39 15 *nam licet ipse nihil possis temptare nec ausis.* The reading of one ms. *ausis*, is probably right, though the *ausus* of the others has a parallel in Aen. ix 428 429 :

nihil iste nec ausus

nec potuit.

Fab. 41 16 *ausa pharetratis nubibus ista loqui.* The parallel *pharetratæ brumæ*, cited by Ellis, seems convincing; otherwise 'the artillery of the clouds' is not in the quiet vein of Avianus. *Foret tantis*, read by Bährens, is cited by Cannegieter from his 'Cortianus 2.'

Fab. 42 8 *regemens.* Freund and his followers say that this word occurs 'perhaps' only in two passages of Statius; Ellis adds two of Sidonius. Georges has these four examples, with yet two others, one from the Culex, one from Corippus. It would seem impossible to use Freund for a week, without discovering that his general statements about the whole compass of Latinity are to be narrowed (especially from the letter D downwards) to that portion of Latin usage which is stored in Forcellini. Yet his editors repeat his vainglorious *dicta* without suspicion.

After the commentary follows 'Excursus I. *Praesumere*' (in the sense of 'to presume, arrogate'). 'Excursus II. *Coniecturae Babrianae*,' originally published in the American Journal of Philology.

The book ends with an index of words (pp. 133-151) for which 'I am indebted to my friend Mr. Charles Bradburne of Trinity College.'

This index seems to include every word but *et* and *que*. I tested it for one fable, and found no error or omission. Each form, as in the Delphin indexes, occurs in its own place (e.g. *verba*, *verbera*, *verbere*, *verberibus*, *verbis*, *verbo*, *verborum*), a much more helpful arrangement than that adopted in Schenkl's Calpurnius, where only one form of each word is registered, (in verbs always the present infinitive). But even this is open

to grave objections, as different cases, genders, parts of verbs, even entirely different words which happen to be spelt alike (e.g. *cum*), are confounded together. Jahn's index to Juvenal is not a model of excellence, but it does aim at sorting the articles according to the various cases etc. Another blot on the index I have already touched upon; it makes no distinction between conjectural readings and those founded on ms. evidence; nay, the latter, if ousted from the text, have no place at all in the index. A fortnight would have sufficed to compile a complete Lexicon Avianianum, which might have recorded the various readings, as Bruder does for the N.T., Meusel and Menge-Preuss for Caesar. Even something far short of a lexicon would have been welcome; thus Cannegieter's index for the two words cited above gives (*verbera caudæ* — *mollia* — *prohiberet* — *submittens*; *verbere commotas minas*; *verberibus domat*; *verba asperiora* — *darent* — *dedisse* — *dedit* — *multa* — *secreta*; *in verba redire*; *verbis compulsus* — *certare* — *fallacibus* — *pravis insistere* — *rectis*: *verbo hoc*; *verborum fidem*).

Cannegieter has also an 'Index II. In Notas' (32 pp.), 'Index III. Scriptorum antiquorum qui in Notis atque in Dissertatione illustrantur, emendantur.' There is so much new and valuable matter in the Oxford edition, that it deserved a good index to the notes. I have enriched the margins of a lexicon with the principal contributions here made to lexicography; but how many will have patience to do likewise?

A singular omission is that of an 'index fabularum.' Cannegieter has an alphabetical one, immediately after his preface: the new edition compels us to consult 45 pages to learn the subjects of the 42 fables. The notes have the monotonous running heading, 'commentary,' so that one must often turn a page to find out where one is. These headings should always form a table of contents.

Mr. Ellis sets a noble example of conscientious diligence, and his works cannot be safely neglected by any serious student of Latin literature. With a few hours more labour, and a few pages more print, he might have enabled us to dispense with all previous editions of Avianus. If in future he will add a complete lexicon to each volume, and make his lexicographical collections subsidiary to the best lexicons of the day, he will not want imitators, and England will contribute her fair quota to that *Thesaurus Latinae Linguae* to which Wölfflin is devoting himself with a rare self-sacrifice.

JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

STUDIA BIBLICA.

Studia Biblica. Essays in Biblical Archaeology and Criticism, and Kindred Subjects.

BY MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1885. Svo. pp. 263. 10s. 6d.

It is not often that we meet with a volume of more interest than this. Amongst the writers are Profs. Driver, Neubauer, Sanday and Wordsworth (now Bishop).

Prof. Neubauer treats of 'the Dialects spoken in Palestine in the time of Christ,' and the results which he finds probable are: that '(1) in Jerusalem and perhaps also in the greater part of Judea the modernised Hebrew and a purer Aramaic dialect were in use among the majority of the Jews; (2) the Galileans and the Jewish immigrants from the neighbouring districts understood their own dialect only (of course closely related to the Aramaic), together with a few current Hebrew expressions such as proverbs and prayers; (3) the small Jewish-Greek colony and some privileged persons spoke Greek, which was however a translation from the Hebrew rather than genuine Greek, in a word, a Judeo-Greek jargon.' Hence he concludes that 'the language which the disciples of Jesus spoke and wrote' was that represented by the Talmud of Jerusalem, a Galilean composition. In this he adopts the conclusion of Böhl (*Forschungen nach einer Volksbibel* u.s.w.). We need not say that he supports his view with much learning, nevertheless there are not a few weak points in his reasoning which is substantially that of De Rossi and Pfannkuche.¹ For example, as a proof that the Septuagint translation was unknown in Palestine except to men of the schools and perhaps a few of the Hellenistic Jews, he cites the well-known condemnation of that version in the Talmud. There is no doubt that the Jews in the second century became dissatisfied with the LXX. (partly perhaps on account of the use made of it by the Christians), and desirous to possess a more literal translation. The desideratum was supplied by Aquila and others, with the natural result that the

Septuagint fell into further discredit. It is clear that the language of the Talmud long afterwards has no value as evidence of the light in which the version of the LXX. was regarded in the time of Christ. The use made of it in the New Testament, even in an Epistle to the Hebrews, is contemporary evidence and leads to a different conclusion. The quotations in the Gospels cannot be accounted for by the supposition that they are derived from a Targum, unless that Targum was itself founded on the LXX. But even apart from the New Testament, there is evidence usually considered sufficient, that in the time of the Apostles and earlier the Jews found no fault with the version. The first book of Maccabees exhibits evidence of its influence, and the second book even quotes from it. Nay there is reason to think that the LXX. exercised an influence over the Haggadic exegesis of Palestine. Thus when we are told that the witch of Endor recognised Saul (1 Sam. xxviii. 12) by the fact that Samuel came up on his feet, not on his head, as spirits did to ordinary inquirers, we trace the senseless fable to the Greek rendering ὀρθίον, which is due to a mistake of one letter in the Hebrew (*zaqeph* for *zaqen*). Frankel's hypothesis that the rendering ὀρθίον arose from the fable which is then assumed as an ultimate fact is preposterous. Böhl maintains that the LXX. version was so highly esteemed that the Bible in popular use was a translation from it into Aramaic.

The question is not about the total extinction of the language of the Jews, but about the extent to which Greek was understood. Paulus, who held that the Jews of Palestine were largely bilingual, referred to 2 Macc. iv. 13, where it is stated that in the time of Jason (second century B.C.) there was a rage for Greek fashions and a desire to be like the Greeks in everything; this, he observed, favoured the supposition that the language also was widely adopted. De Sacy's reply² is that there was sufficient time afterwards for the Hebrew again to displace the Greek before the time of Christ. But then it must be remembered that Herod also used great efforts to introduce Greek culture. De Sacy indeed, did not feel his victory so easy as Mr. Neubauer thinks, and fell back on what

¹ *On the Language of Palestine in the Age of Christ and his Apostles.* By De Rossi and Dr. H. F. Pfannkuche. Translated by Thorl. G. Repp. Clark's Biblical Cabinet, vol. ii. De Rossi's work is entitled *Della lingua propria di Cristo e degli Ebrei nazionali della Palestina da' tempi de' Maccabei*. Parma, 1772.

² De Sacy's paper is in Millius' *Magasin Encyclopédique* for 1805, tom. i pp. 125-147. It is a review of a Dissertation by Paulus, published in the form of two University Programmes. (Jena, 1803.)

he regarded as the irrefragable argument of the surprise of the multitude on the day of Pentecost. 'Are not all these which speak Galileans?' But the supposition that the surprise was felt simply at Galileans speaking Greek does not satisfy the requirements of the text, which shows that the multitude were surprised that men of so many different countries heard *ἕκαστος τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ*. Let this pass, however. De Sacy believed that the Apostles spoke Greek by a miracle, and thought that Paulus was biassed by disbelief in miracles. If Mr. Neubauer thinks that the Apostles, unlettered Galileans, spoke Greek without a miracle, then he must admit that Greek was pretty widely known in Galilee: what then becomes of his thesis?¹

Mr. Neubauer again asks (following Pfannkuche), 'Why should the chief captain wonder that St. Paul could speak Greek if the Jews were generally familiar with it?' The chief captain has himself answered the question; he did not know that Paul was a Jew, but thought he was an Egyptian. Pfannkuche understands this to mean an Egyptian Jew, and as he thinks that the uncultivated Egyptian Jews knew no Greek, he is consistent in asking the question. But Mr. Neubauer holds that the Jews in Egypt had completely forgotten their language long before this (p. 69); how then is the question in his mouth relevant or consistent? It is worth observing also that St. Luke specially mentions the fact that St. Paul spoke *τῇ Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ*, in order to introduce the remark that on this account the people 'were more quiet,' *μᾶλλον παρέσχον ἡσυχίαν*. Does not this imply that they would not have been surprised and would have understood, had he spoken Greek?

Again Mr. Neubauer asks: 'Would any one venture to maintain that St. Peter spoke Greek when he addressed himself to the "men of Judea and all that dwell in Jerusalem" and that too at Pentecost, when all the prayers were offered in Hebrew,' as, be it observed, they still are. 'How would the Medes, Elamites and Arabians have understood if he had spoken Greek?' To the first question we may reply that the audience did not consist wholly or perhaps chiefly of men of Judea, and we may quite as effectively

ask, Would Peter have used a language which probably most of his hearers would not understand, especially as we may reasonably suppose that it was principally the strangers that he hoped to influence? The 3000 who were converted were doubtless not Jews of Jerusalem. As to the second question, we need only refer to what Mr. Neubauer himself says (pp. 69, 70) of the Jews in various parts of Asia and elsewhere, who, 'far away from Palestine, spoke only Greek.' In fact are not these Medes and Elamites, etc. the very same men whom he finds just before addressed by the Apostles in Greek, as he holds, and calling it their own dialect or language? Again, referring to St. Luke's statement that Jesus addressed Paul on the way to Damascus in 'Hebrew,' he says that not remembering or being able to supply the Hebrew words, 'he was obliged, in order to be believed, to state that Jesus spoke in Hebrew.' Surely if St. Luke had said nothing about the language used, no reader would have made the omission an objection to the story. A historian does not usually state in what language words were spoken unless he has some special reason for doing so, as St. Luke had in Acts xiv. 11, xxi. 40. His not stating that Peter spoke in Hebrew on the day of Pentecost is not regarded by Mr. Neubauer himself as an objection to the supposition that he did so. In the case of the words addressed to Saul, how much more natural it is to suppose that the Hebrew language is specified because it was not a matter of course than because it was. May we not ask also, 'In what language did Jesus converse with Pilate, or does the historian's silence about the language affect in any way the credit of the story?'

The language of the books of the New Testament is a fact of the first importance in the question. Prof. Neubauer (following Pfannkuche) speaks of the Gospels as translations, and the few Aramaic expressions that occur he describes as 'left by the translators.' Whether he agrees with Pfannkuche in supposing that they were left through inadvertence (!) does not appear. The supposition is contradicted by the fact that, wherever necessary, a translation is subjoined (as, *ex. gr.* to *ἐφθαθά* and *ταλιθα κουμι*). This circumstance also proves that it was not from inability to find a Greek equivalent that the Aramaic words were retained. We can understand the retention of the words spoken on the cross as necessary to explain the misunderstanding of 'Eli, Eli' as a call for Elias. We may, however, ask in passing, How came the Jewish bystanders (most likely

¹ Perhaps it may not be irrelevant to mention that we have heard persons in Middlesex, who had just been listening to a preacher from Ireland, express surprise that they had been able to understand every word he said. Yet they had not expected that he would speak Celtic. (The preacher, by the way, was after all a native of Essex.)

men of Jerusalem) to make such a mistake? But as to the other expressions quoted, why did not St. Mark say simply: 'λέγει αὐτῷ Διανοίχθητι,' instead of 'λέγει αὐτῷ ἐφφαθά, ὃ ἐστι Διανοίχθητι'? Only two explanations seem easy, either that Jesus himself did not use Aramaic except on particular occasions, or that St. Mark's informant (according to early tradition, Peter), spoke Greek, and only preserved the original Aramaic in these two cases of 'wonder-working' words which we may suppose had strongly impressed themselves on his memory.

A quite different question is that relating to the Aramaic words occurring in the narrative. Of these Prof. Neubauer gives a heterogeneous list. Some are proper names such as Bethesda, Golgotha, Satanas, Beelzebub, and from these it is clear that no inference can be drawn. What again can we infer from such words as Rabbi, or Messiah, words used to the present day by Jews whatever their vernacular may be? Κορβάν, again, which is as much Hebrew as Aramaic, is a technical legal term as much as *habeas corpus*, *cestuique*, and other phrases in use amongst ourselves. But what does Mr. Neubauer mean by including in his list words which occur in the LXX., and which therefore formed part of the vocabulary of every Greek-speaking Jew? Such are πᾶσχα, κρίκερα (actually quoted from the LXX., Luke i. 15), γέερα (Josh. xviii. 16, γαίερα). The last may indeed be reckoned a proper name. Certainly γέερα owes its clipped form to its use by Greek-speaking people. What these really prove is the use of the LXX.; how they can be supposed to support the view that the users did not speak Greek, it is hard to see. Φαρισαῖος does not occur in the LXX., but it is a word which would of necessity be adopted by Greek-speaking Jews, having, like γέερα, no possible equivalent in Greek. Its form is completely Greek.

Pfannkuche's list (followed by a very recent writer) includes in addition χάρις, and the Latin words λεγών, σπεκουλάτορ, συνδάριον, κολονία. Now χάρις is found in Greek authorities (Plato Comicus and Inserr.; see Liddell and Scott); συνδάριον, in the Doric form σινδάριον, occurs in a writer of the fifth century B.C. (Hermippus). These examples show how little value is to be attached to the supposed non-occurrence of a word outside the Greek Testament. But as to 'legio' or 'speculator,' why could not a Greek-speaking Jew pick up these words directly from the Romans as easily as one ignorant of Greek? 'Colonia,' found only in Acts xvi. 12, is said to be borrowed from the

Aramaic, as if forsooth even a Jew, not to say a Gentile (as the author of the Acts was) residing for a time in a Roman colony, could not know or use the word except through Aramaic. Can anything be added to this absurdity? Yes, there is one thing more; there is absolutely no proof that these words were in use in Aramaic before the Gospels and Acts were written. Mr. Neubauer does not include these Latin words in his list. The only expression that seems to us of any weight in the question is μαρὰν ἀθά which curiously enough occurs in an epistle to Greeks in Europe. It may perhaps be compared to our use of 'Kyrie eleison.' There is, however, nothing to connect it with the Jews of Palestine.

The postulate that the Gospels are translations whether in whole or in part is sufficiently bold. Three of them are on all sides admitted to have been written in Greek; and as to the first Gospel, even those who accept the tradition that St. Matthew wrote originally in Hebrew, yet generally feel compelled to admit that the existing gospel which bears his name is not a translation. Indeed this may be regarded as proved by the language of Jerome, the only one of our authorities who had seen or could read the supposed original. And if, as is usually held, the Epistle of St. James was written in Greek, this is a most weighty circumstance, since St. James appears never to have left Jerusalem. Bishop Wordsworth, indeed, in an essay in the present volume suggests the theory that this epistle was originally written in Aramaic, and reminds us that a similar hypothesis has been maintained with respect to the Epistle to the Hebrews. It would be of more consequence, however, if he could state that this hypothesis had been accepted, instead of being generally rejected. But now if the first gospel (to say nothing of the others) and one or two important epistles had been written in Aramaic, we have to answer the question, 'How was it that the Syrian churches in the second century entirely neglected or forgot these originals, and adopted into their Canon translations from the Greek?' The fact that some of the Apocryphal books were originally written in Hebrew appears rather unfavourable than otherwise to Prof. Neubauer's view. For the early and complete loss of the originals shows that, although the writers preferred to use Hebrew (or Aramaic), the readers preferred Greek.

Mr. Neubauer names Bernhardt as stating that the Greek spoken by the Asiatic peoples was a mere jargon. He has apparently bor-

rowed the reference from Böhl, who cites Bernhardt's *Grundriss der [zur Böhl] Griechischen Litteratur*, p. 492 (fourth edition, p. 505). Bernhardt's remark in the place cited has no reference to Palestine, for his judgment about which he remits his reader to another place. Speaking in p. 492 of the spread of Hellenic speech after Alexander's conquests from Asia Minor even as far as the interior of the Persian empire, where hitherto few colonies existed, but where there was now a complete military occupation, he quotes Niebuhr (*Kleine philol. Schriften*, ii. 198), to the effect that where whole masses adopt the language of their rulers, they do so in the form easiest in themselves and thus arises a 'jargon.' His observations about Palestine are on p. 519 (533, fourth edition) where he says that although for a long period

since Antiochus Epiphanes Palestine had been filled with a Greek population [differing in this from the places spoken of before], it was not till the time of Herod that a taste was acquired for Greek and Roman culture, adding that it is clear from passages in Rabbinical writers cited by Tholuck (*Brief an d. Hebräer*, 1850, p. 113 ff.): 'dass Griechisch als feine Sprache des Umgangs galt; die Gelehrten kannten diese Sprache, schätzten sie sogar vor dem Aramäischen.' It is on the whole clear that the arguments of Pfannkuche and Mr. Neubauer require sifting and revision before they can produce conviction. The reader would find it interesting to compare their reasoning with that of Dr. Roberts in his *Discussions on the Gospels*, 2nd ed., 1864.

T. K. ABBOTT.

THE CONDITIONAL SENTENCE IN LATIN.

PROF. SONNENSCHN'S paper in the last number of the *Classical Review* seems to call for some remarks from the inculcated grammarians. I am partially absolved in a note, but still have something to say on the points brought forward.

I agree with the writer on the first two points:—that is to say, I hold that the Indicative in the protasis of a Conditional sentence does not imply reality, and that the Present Subjunctive in the protasis does not imply possibility. I long ago spoke so definitely on this matter in the preface to my *Grammar*, ii. pp. xcix., c., and in (the passage quoted by the Professor) § 1497 that I can only express my pleasure at our having come to the same view. But when he speaks of the Present Subjunctive in such sentences as expressing 'so natural an idea as a supposition referring to the future and accompanied by reserve,' I think he forgets that 'reserve' is really expressed by the use of a conditional particle. The difference between *si hoc dicis, erras* and *si hoc dicas, erres* is that the Indicative leaves it undecided whether 'you are saying it' or not, the Subjunctive marks at once that 'you are not saying it.' The Subjunctive implies thought as opposed to fact, and in such sentences by a secondary contrast it implies *not fact*. Neither Subjunctive nor Indicative implies any anticipation of future action, or any further caution or reserve than is inherent in every Conditional sentence.

The third opinion which Prof. Sonnenschein combats is 'that the Imperfect Subjunctive refers primarily to the past.' If he had said that it does not refer to the future (except, in reported speech, to the relatively future) I should have agreed with him: and much that he says might be used in support of this second proposition. I believe *si hoc diceret erraret* is often supposed to correspond to our English 'if he should say this, he would be wrong,' and to the ordinary use of the Greek Optative, and I agree with Prof. Sonnenschein in holding this view to be wrong. But his own proposition is more doubtful. He appears to me to confound two very different things—an equal number of instances and an equal legitimacy of use. I agree that in the majority of instances the Imperfect Subjunctive in the protasis (and I add in the apodosis also) of Conditional sentences refers to what he calls present time, but except in this statistical sense I do not think that it 'refers primarily' to the present.

The fact is, present time is a mere limit between past and future (see my § 1455), and has no duration of itself. The grammarian may say with the moralist, *fugit hora: hoc quod loquor inde est*. The Imperfect Subjunctive is used in these sentences, when you contemplate the present as the resultant of the past, and the Present Subjunctive is used when you contemplate the

present as the starting point of the future. But the Imperfect is also in conditional, as well as in other, sentences used of a continuous state, contemporaneous with some past action or time; and this use is every bit as good Latin as its use of the present time. I never dreamt of implying, as Prof. Sonnenschein seems to think, by my statement in § 1530 *c* that I 'put the reference to the present and to the past on the same footing' in point of frequency of use (I well knew the case to be otherwise), but I did mean to imply that they were both perfectly legitimate. And I can see nothing at all strange in Cicero's pointed expression *Nunc quemadmodum audiar sentio, at tunc si dicerem non audirer* (Cic. *Clu.* 29, § 80). I do not know Priem's paper to which Prof. Sonnenschein refers, but I find in Etzler (*Sprach-Erörterungen*, 1826, p. 189) sufficient instances from one book of Cicero to prove all that I want. See *Verr.* iii. § 32 *faceres...posset*; 65 *fieret...concederes*; 115 *ageretur...postularent*; 129 *perpeterere...pertinerent*. Where there is nothing illogical or unnatural in the use, a few instances from a writer like Cicero are sufficient to establish its correctness. Murder does not cease to be a crime because it is less frequent than theft.

Such translations as *si hoc faceret, erraret* 'if he had been doing this, he would have been erring,' are no doubt awkward, but they are used simply for technical purposes to point out the difference between Latin Imperfects and Pluperfects. 'Had he done this, he would be wrong' is better English. 'If he did this' would serve equally for *si faceret* and *si faciebat*, perhaps even for *si fecisset*. The first sentence quoted by Prof. Sonnenschein of an Imperfect 'where all reference to the past is absolutely excluded' (p. 128) *si iudex non esses, te potissimum petere oporteret* (Cic. *Verr.* iv. § 70), I should

translate 'Had you not been judge, you would have been the very man to be plaintiff.' The English idiom has exactly the same ambiguity as the Latin Imperfect Subjunctive. Nor need I confine it to the Subjunctive. Cf. *Longum erat*, &c., my *Grammar*, § 1535.

There is some danger in looking, as Prof. Sonnenschein tries to do (p. 124), exclusively at the protasis. The protasis after all is only a dependent sentence—grammatically, though not logically, dependent on the apodosis, and consequently, so far as the two are correlated, liable to be affected by its principal. I have found this consideration useful in classifying conditional usages, and venture to refer Prof. Sonnenschein in his 'further investigation' of some instances given on p. 127 to my §§ 1566—1570.

After what I have said above I will only say on Prof. Sonnenschein's fourth head that I have no hesitation in *not* referring to the future the instances he mentions at the end of his paper. But his reference to Madvig, § 347 *b* suggests to me to note here a curious vacillation in that great scholar's treatment of this question. In the first edition of his *Latin Grammar* we read 'Was jetzt oder in der Zukunft stattfinden würde, oder (gegen die Wirklichkeit) als stattfindend vorausgesetzt wird, wird durch das Imperfectum bezeichnet.' In the third edition (1857), which is obviously for many purposes still the standard, the words 'oder in der Zukunft' are left out. In the fourth and last ('improved and abridged') edition, 1867, he, as I think, wrongly reinserts these words, and omits all reference to the use of the Imperfect in reference to the past (note 2 to § 347, ed. 3). I have great difficulty in believing this reinsertion to have been deliberate.

H. J. ROBY.

SHORTER NOTICES.

Homeri Iliadis Carmina, edidit A. RZACH. Pars prior, 1886; pars altera, 1887. Mk. 1.25.

Homeri Odyssea. Scholarum in usum edidit P. CAUER. Pars prior, 1886, Mk. 1.20; pars altera, 1887, Mk. 1.20.

Homeri Hymni Epigrammata Batrachomyomachia, edidit E. ABEL. 1887. Mk. 1.80.

RZACH and CAUER are entirely dependent upon La Roche for the MSS., as every editor must be until the new critical edition by Ludwig, which I am glad to see that CAUER promises in his preface, sets

the diplomatic evidence on a firm basis. Both editors give texts which embody the more certain results of recent criticism. Both for instance write *ῥοιῖοιο πολεμῖοιο*, *ῥῖα* for *ῥῶ* in the fifth foot, *ῥος* for *ῥας* as a trochee; but while RZACH has *κοῖλος* with Nauck, CAUER retains *κοῖλος*. Neither writes the *ϛ*, but RZACH follows Nauck in omitting *ν* *ἑφελκυστικόν* when followed by a word beginning with *ϛ*, CAUER more consistently retains it. RZACH contents himself with a brief preface of a couple of pages, but CAUER has an interesting introduction explaining the principles which he has followed; attention may be

particularly called to his remarks on the vexed question of ϵ and η in forms like $\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\eta\varsigma$, $\theta\acute{\eta}\eta\varsigma$. He follows Aristarchos in writing long e as η in all cases before c and i sounds, and before o and a sounds when it comes from α ; but as ϵ when it arises from ϵ and stands before o and a sounds; thus $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\theta\epsilon\lambda\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$, $\epsilon\pi\iota\beta\acute{\eta}\mu\epsilon\nu$, $\theta\acute{\eta}\eta\varsigma$, $\chi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\iota\alpha$, $\chi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\eta\varsigma$. He thus agrees with Mr. Monro (*Hom. Grammar* p. 318) in holding that 'the long vowel of E-stems, such as $\theta\eta$ - $\delta\alpha\mu\eta$ -etc., was not originally the same sound as the Ionic η which represents older $\tilde{a}$,' and that the two were differently affected by the phonetic influence of the following vowel.

Abel's edition of the Homeric hymns is a real advance, as it is a complete recension of the text based on a much needed new collation of the MSS., and entirely supplants Baumeister's praiseworthy but now antiquated work. It thus stands side by side with Gemoll's excellent edition, which appeared almost simultaneously, but late enough for the addition of a critical appendix in which Abel's readings are recorded. Gemoll is thus fuller in his apparatus, as he not only incorporates Abel's work, but gives throughout the readings of the 'Paris class' of MSS. which Abel deliberately omits as worthless. Abel however is more convenient for practical use, at least for those who decline the aid of Gemoll's excellent and original commentary.—W. LEAF.

Der Dialect der homerischen Gedichte: von Dr. J. VAN LEEUWEN, Jr. und M. B. MENDES DA COSTA, aus dem Holländischen übersetzt von Dr. E. MEHLER. Leipzig. Teubner. 1886. 8vo. pp. 158. Mk. 2.40.

THIS little book—the work of two Dutch scholars, now translated into German—gives a useful summary of Homeric accentuation, with especial reference to the progress which has been made of late towards recovering the original forms of the dialect. This work, as is well known, may be, and has been, carried on in more than one way. We may approach it, with H. L. Ahrens and G. Curtius, from the vantage-ground of comparative Indo-European grammar; or we may confine ourselves, as Bekker did in the last generation, and as Cobet and Nauck still do, to the use of comparison within the field of the Greek language. The latter is the method chiefly followed in the book before us, the authors of which are thoroughly imbued with the spirit of Cobet's criticism, and inclined to look with some distrust upon facts which lie beyond a strictly Hellenic horizon. The two methods, indeed, do not necessarily come into conflict: for all true conclusions (as Aristotle said) are harmonious. The restoration of the digamma, to take the most prominent example, may be accomplished (1) by comparing Greek with other languages which have preserved a labial spirant: or (2) by studying the metrical facts of Homer. But neither process gives such complete and certain results that we can afford to be satisfied with it alone. And in any case it is unscientific not to avail ourselves to the full of two sources of evidence which by their entire independence are peculiarly fitted to correct and supplement each other.

A few examples will show the nature of the preference shown by our authors for purely Greek analogies.

1. The loss of the augment in Homer, they say (p. 68), must be regarded as aphaeresis: and accordingly in the example of a restored primitive text given at the end of the book they write $\tau\epsilon\upsilon\chi\epsilon$, $\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\alpha\tau\omicron$, and so on. They add that the omission of the augment in such a verb as $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omega$ can also 'perhaps' be regarded as an aphaeresis. This last kind of 'aphaeresis' is quite without parallel in Greek, or indeed in any language: yet it must be admitted unless the authors

consent to leave forms like $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon$ for $\tilde{\eta}\gamma\epsilon$ out of their theory. But the real objection surely is that the use of forms without augment is common to the oldest Greek and the oldest Sanscrit.

2. The Perfects in $-\acute{\alpha}$ ($-\phi\alpha$ and $-\chi\alpha$) are said to be probably derived from those in $-\kappa\alpha$, by k passing into h (p. 80). No evidence is given of this phonetic change ever having taken place in Greek. The fact that Perfects in $-\kappa\alpha$ appear earlier than those which aspirate a radical π or κ (giving $-\phi\alpha$, $-\chi\alpha$), is far from proving that the latter are to be derived from the former—at least this would be the opinion of students of comparative grammar.

3. The treatment of the form $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\omega$ (p. 83) is an interesting example of conflict between the two methods. From a Greek point of view it seems to be present, and as such it stands alone, and deserves all the epithets, 'unheard of,' 'impossible,' 'inconceivable,' which are wont to be applied to an anomaly. On the other hand $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\iota\alpha$, which also occurs in our texts, is supported as a perfect by other forms, $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\iota\epsilon$, $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\iota\mu\epsilon\nu$, $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\iota\alpha\sigma\iota$, $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\iota\acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon\varsigma$, &c. Hence Cobet and Nauck unhesitatingly change $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\omega$ into $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\iota\alpha$. But comparative grammarians point out that $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\phi\iota\alpha$ is not correctly formed from a root $\delta\phi\iota$. The true form, as their more exact analysis shows, is $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\phi\omicron\iota\alpha$, which might become $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\phi\omicron\alpha$, and so $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\phi\omega$, $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\omega$. Accordingly, instead of turning $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\omega$ into $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\iota\alpha$ or $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\phi\iota\alpha$, they turn $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\iota\alpha$ into $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\phi\omicron\alpha$ or $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\omega$.

4. We may add to this list the assumption of such forms as $\acute{\epsilon}\phi\phi\alpha\delta\epsilon$, $\acute{\epsilon}\phi\phi\iota\delta\epsilon$ (for $\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\delta\epsilon$, $\epsilon\iota\sigma\iota\delta\epsilon$). It may be too much to maintain that a double digamma is impossible; but certainly there is no trace of the corresponding labial of other languages, such as Latin or Sanscrit, being either pronounced or written as a double letter.

5. In the list of digammated words given by our authors (p. 28), we find $\phi\acute{\omicron}\delta\acute{\rho}\omega\nu$ and $\phi\acute{\omega}\varsigma$. They have overlooked an interesting paper by L. Meyer (*K. Z.* xxiii. p. 49 ff.), in which he shows that ϕ never remains in Homer before o or ω . And in the case of these two forms the independent evidence of the ϕ is of the slightest.

It will be understood that the objections on which we have been insisting apply rather to the school of philology which this book represents than to the work itself. Its merits, on the other hand, are of a solid and useful kind. Readers will find in it the best results of an important vein of enquiry—that which seeks to purify the Homeric text from the corruption and modernisation that it must have undergone during the centuries when written copies were few and diplomatic criticism had not begun. This is an inquiry which was set in motion by Bentley, and is evidently by no means exhausted.—D. B. MONRO.

The Metamorphoses of Ovid. Books XIII. and XIV.
Edited by CHARLES SIMMONS, M.A. Macmillan.
4s. 6d.

THIS is a scholarly edition of two of the books of the *Metamorphoses*, best suited for school reading. The introduction deals with the design of the poem, and justly dwells upon the consummate art with which Ovid has woven into one harmonious whole a web of stories entirely disconnected, save by the one recurring incident of a metamorphosis. Mr. Simmons has conscientiously studied most modern editions; though those of Loers (1843) and Magnus (1885) might have been consulted. The notes are marked by a good knowledge of the author, accuracy, and genuine poetic feeling; and are well calculated to stimulate interest. Particularly good are those on *invidiosus* (XIII. 414), the relation of *gener* and *socer* (*ib.* 509), Ovid's fondness for substantives in *-men* (*ib.* 778), and the Sibil's

cave (XIV. 104). Grammatical points are often happily handled, *e.g.* zeugma (XIII. 632), and 'adjectival substantives' (XIV. 362); but the grammatical matter seems to me a trifle in excess. Thus the frequent illustration of Latin from Greek idiom is superfluous, and sometimes misleading, *e.g.* XIII. 508, *maxima rerum*, the gen. is partitive, and Conington's notion of a local gen. should not be revived; and the note on the coordinate relative with infin. (XIV. 226) is unnecessary, as the usage has not 'been neglected by the grammars,' see Madvig, § 402 *a* and *b*, Roby § 1781. Omissions are few, though *iamdudum* with imperat. = 'immediately' (XIII. 457), the rare *mi* for *mihi* (*ib.* 503, cp. IX. 191), and the almost certainly right reading *revulsum* (XIV. 181), might have been noticed. In the following places I differ from the editor: XIII. 114, *cur spoliis erit* should not be translated, 'there will be cause for spoiling you,' for the preceding *quod* forms the subject; cp. *inf.* 527, F. iii. 629; XIII. 165, *arma* is surely simply the shield and spear brought by Ulysses; XIII. 277, *novus in officio* = 'ninth in offering his service,' not 'in loyalty'; XIII. 338, *conferat* is not hypothetical but deliberative; XIII. 356, *moderatio Ajax* = not 'a wiser' but 'the less presumptuous Ajax'; XIII. 451, *plus quam femina virgo*, '*virgo* expresses the age [were there then no old maids?] *femina* the sex.' Rather, the offering demanded was not merely a woman, but the maiden Polyxena; XIII. 718, *subiectis pennis* means not 'sudden (new-created) wings,' but 'wings put beneath,' *i.e.* attached to them; XIV. 133, the indirect *patuisset* = a direct fut. pf. indic., and similarly line 141, *paterer* = a fut. simple in direct speech; *carina* may have originally meant 'hull' (XIV. 534), but surely it means 'keel' in XIV. 552, '*mediisque carina subdita navigiis spinæ mutatur in usum*'; Cyclop is incorrectly printed for Cyclops (pp. 31, 47, 158, 162, 167). What authority is there for naming Ovid's friend *M. Junius Brutus* (p. xi.)?

But, leaving these *minutiae*, the work as a whole is excellent, and strongly to be recommended. A most interesting feature is a number of remarks, mainly critical, by Mr. R. Ellis, in which he quotes the readings of four Bodleian MSS. Of these the best is Can. 7, which often preserves the right reading where the Marcianus is wrong. Mr. Ellis contributes many acute conjectures; the best perhaps are *timidi hard audacis* (XIV. 671), and *est locus ullerius* (XIV. 489); but *Clarius subtil, hicque* (XIV. 612) seems to me open to doubt on grounds of euphony; see Madvig on *de Fin.* v. 40, Haupt, *Opusc.* iii. 510.

S. G. OWEN.

Éléments de Grammaire Latine (d'après Lhomond), par GEORGES ÉDON, Paris: Belin, 1886, 16th edition. 360 pp., small 8vo. 2 frs.

THE name of Lhomond has an old world ring about it, and from a book which 'demeure entièrement conforme au plan de Lhomond' one must not expect modern ideas on the teaching of grammar. '*Si veut l'indicatif devant le présent et le parfait; le subjonctif devant l'imparfait et le plus-que-parfait.*' 'Le régime du verbe passif se met à l'ablatif avec *a* ou *ab*, quand' etc. The term *Que retranché* for accusative with the infinitive, which has died so hard in France, is in this edition at last given up with a sigh of regret in favour of *Proposition Infinitive*. The rubric 'Mots interrogatifs entre deux verbes' only partially gives place to *Interrogation Indirecte*. In a word, there is no trace of an attempt to base Syntax on the analysis of the sentence, or to insist on an intelligent grasp of principle. The method is purely empirical. On the other hand the

book has merits of a practical kind. The construction of impersonal verbs, for instance, may be found without hunting through all the cases. In general the arrangement may be said to aim at following the order of a French pupil's ideas. The *Accidence* is laudably unencumbered with philology. '*Nous nous sommes bien gardés de compliquer l'étude de la déclinaison et de la conjugaison latines, pour la satisfaction toute gratuite d'en faire une exposition plus savante.*' In the third declension we find, instead of the monstrous array of paradigms given in some English grammars, only three—*soror*, *corpus*, *avis*: two more (*securis*, *cubile*) are added in a *Supplément aux Déclinaisons*, which forms part of the body of the book. Better examples might have been perhaps chosen, but the limitation of number is entirely commendable. *Accipio* is conjugated in full. The treatment of verb-nouns is unsatisfactory, but in accordance with French practice: '*En avec le participe présent veut le verbe latin au gérondif en do.*'—Following the Syntax is a third part—*Méthode pour exprimer les Gallicismes*: a fourth part gives a short sketch of Metre, Prosody and Accentuation.—E. A. S.

Grammaire Latine par SALOMON REINACH, Paris; Delagrave; 1886. 358 pp., large 8vo. 5 frs.

THE author has aimed at producing a grammar more suitable for schools and colleges than what he calls the 'dictionnaires grammaticaux' of Guardia—Wierzeyski and Madvig (Theil's translation)—the only books hitherto available for advanced pupils in France. To treat grammar in a manner '*à la fois élémentaire et scientifique*' is an exceedingly difficult task; and the author has done well to put his science and his elementary instruction in different parts of his book. An Appendix discusses such questions as '*Place du Latin dans la famille Aryenne*,' '*Phonétique Latine*,' '*Théorie comparée de la Déclinaison*,' etc., and shows that the author is fully abreast of modern philological science; in the body of the book he has wisely decided to be practical. In the declension of nouns we hear nothing about vowel and consonant stems; the terminations are added to the *radical* or *thème*—a form obtained by rejecting the termination of the Genitive Singular.

That this is the best way of treating the subject for beginners appears to be the result at which experienced teachers in Germany too have generally arrived. The verbal forms are divided thus: *am-o*, *am-abam*, *am-avi*, *am-aturus*. Here the author distinctly goes too far. It is really more practical, as well as more correct, to recognise three themes as a basis of the verb forms: *leg-*, *lég-*, *lect-*. Would it not be also more practical to follow the Germans in discarding the time-honoured *amo* in favour of some verb like *lando*, which admits of sharper distinction of meaning between its imperfect and perfect tenses? It is strange that in England *amabam* with its meaningless translation 'I was loving' should have kept its place so long.

The Syntax is based on a plan which the author owes to Thurot, his former teacher. It is introduced by a '*Coup d'œil sur la Syntaxe*,'—a brief *résumé* of elementary rules for turning French into Latin. Then follow I. Syntaxe de Co-ordination, II. Syntaxe de Subordination. Under the first head are treated the Concord, Cases, the Adjective, the Pronoun, (including, strangely, the Relative), the Adverb, Voices, and Tenses, together with a few words on Moods. Under the second head comes Thurot's classification of 'Propositions' as A. *Indépendantes* (*Indicatives*, *Volitives*, *Optatives*, *Délibératives*, *Problématiques*, *Concessives*, *Désidératives*): B. *Dépendantes* (*Complétives* *i.e.* clauses introduced by *ut*, *ne*, *quominus*, *quin*, and dependent questions; *Causales*,

Finales, Concécutives, Suppositives, Concessives, Comparatives, Temporelles, Relatives). A chapter on the Infinitive (*Proposition Infinitive*) follows. In this arrangement one recognises a sound principle—that Syntax should be based on a classification of sentences: whether the scheme of analysis adopted is the best possible may be open to doubt. But in general this part of the book deserves considerable praise, as an attempt to introduce into France a rational system of Syntax-teaching.

I append a few criticisms on miscellaneous points. The Optative in Greek is declared in a note to be nothing but an historical subjunctive. This doctrine should not be asserted without noticing that the Optative corresponds in usage quite as much to the present as to the imperfect subj. of Latin. Modern science recognises two distinct moods for Greek (see Brugmann in Iwan Müller).—*Dies me deficiat* is not synonymous, as an apodosis, with *Dies me deficiet*.—The interpretation of *Aen.* IX. 288 *Inque salutatum linquo (nox et tua dextera testis) quod nequeam lacrimas perferre parentis* which is assigned to Thurot, that *quod nequeam* ('je serais incapable') depends on *linquo* is not new, (Conington after Madvig).—Is it really a good thing for French boys to learn gender rules in German? The author has adopted the verses of Zumpt entire. His readers will be inclined to think the French language capable of such lyrical flights as

Commune heisst was einen Mann
Und eine Frau bedeuten kann.

E. A. SONNENSCHN,.

Syntaxe Latine par O. RIEMANN, viii. and 496 pp. Paris: Klincksieck. 4 frs.

THERE is no doubt of the author's competence to write a Latin Syntax. His 'Studies on the language and grammar of Livy,' prove that to any one who is acquainted with them. The same excellent scholarship is seen in this little book. There is much careful discrimination of the usage of particular authors and clear and full statement (with references to the particular passages) of the facts of Latin construction. But the method of exposition is somewhat defective. It is largely built on a comparison of the French and Latin text or idiom. There is no clearly visible and firm skeleton in the treatise. Little attempt is made to arrange, for instance, the usages of the subjunctive under leading conceptions and show their descent and collateral affinities. There are of course many differences among grammarians, but two main schools may be distinguished, those which take their cue from the forms, and those which take it from some abstract classification of the meaning. The former (e.g. Madvig) look to the case and to the mood for their points of grouping: the latter to the character of the qualification or of the sentence. As regards the treatment of case the former has generally prevailed: as regards the sentence the latter school (e.g. Kühner) is perhaps yet predominant. M. Riemann belongs to the latter, and so far I differ from him; and still more when he puts, e.g. as coordinate divisions the indicative, the potential (present and perfect subjunctive) and the 'mode irréel' (imperfect and pluperfect subjunctive). I have not noticed any special novelty of an important character, but some old errors, as I regard them, continue. E.g. he classes under one general head such very different datives as those in *locum castris capere* and *uenire auxilio*; he has a vague dative of 'relation' which contains *oppidum primum est uenientibus ab Epiro* and *id remedium timori fuit*. *Dicat (dixerit) aliquis* appears as potential without question of the frequency of the former or of the mood of the latter. Again

NO. VII. VOL. I.

the historical infinitive receives no further explanation than that it is used to replace in narrations the imperfect indicative: and the gerund (gérondif) and verbal adjective in *-ulus* are treated together without any attempt to account for their parallelism. In the passages of Caesar which M. Riemann as well as myself and others have converted into *oral. recta*, he has mistaken (as I once did) the meaning of *impune injurias tulisse* (B. G. i. 14, § 4) which is not 'suffered wrongs' but 'bore off' i.e. 'committed wrongs' (p. 343). I gladly add that the book is otherwise very accurate.

H. J. R.

DICTIONNAIRE DES ANTIQUITÉS GRECQUES ET ROMAINES d'après les textes et les monuments, contenant l'explication des termes qui se rapportent aux mœurs, aux institutions, à la religion, aux arts, aux sciences, au costume, au mobilier, à la guerre, à la marine, aux métiers, aux monnaies, poids et mesures, etc. etc., et en général à la vie publique et privée des anciens. Ouvrage rédigé par une société d'écrivains spéciaux, d'archéologues et de professeurs, sous la direction de MM. CH. DAREMBERG et EDM. SAGLIO, avec 3000 figures d'après l'antique, dessinées par P. Sellier et gravées par M. Rapin. Paris: Hachette 1873-1887. Vol. I pt. 1 A. B. pp. 1-756. pt. 2 C. pp. 757-1703. large 4to (same size as Littré's French Dictionary, issued by the same firm). Each part 5 frs.

THE enterprising publishers, to whom we owe the magnificent editions of Duruy's History of the Greeks and History of the Romans, the History of Art in Antiquity by G. Perrot and Ch. Chipiez, and an excellent series of annotated editions of Greek and Latin classics, present the learned world in this stately quarto with a work worthy of the country of Saumaise, Hérault, and Montfaucon. No other nation as yet possesses anything approaching to it in beauty and completeness; it is absolutely necessary to every classical library and to every public library frequented by scholars or artists.

When the first *fascicule* (pr. 5 fr., containing 20 sheets of text and 189 engravings) appeared, it was hoped that three or four *fascicules* might appear in a year, and five or six years bring the work to completion. M. Renier, when offering to the Academy of Inscriptions, on 20 June, 1873, the first part, stated that the work had been set on foot, by Daremberg, twelve years before. Abbé Martigny's well-known Dictionary of Christian Antiquities was originally intended to form part of Daremberg's collection.

Among many criticisms, by competent judges, printed on the covers of successive parts, one, by A. Dumont, explains and excuses the slowness of publication: 'il a tout revu (he is speaking of M. Saglio), tout relu, vérifié ces milliers de notes, refondu un grand nombre d'articles pour assurer l'unité de l'ouvrage, sans compter tous ceux qui sont restés son œuvre exclusive.'

Many topics omitted in Smith's and Rich's dictionaries, find a place here, as mythology. The article *Alphabetum* by Lenormant is (as many others are) a complete treatise, occupying 30 pages, and illustrated by 11 plates. References, always at the foot of the page, are attached to each statement of the text, and a bibliography concludes each article. The writers are evidently masters of the literature of their subjects, and references are in general precise and made to the latest editions. Criticism of details would be out of place in dealing in a few lines with a work of vast labour; we would rather congratulate the editor and publishers on the acceleration of their pace (No. 6 appeared in 1879, No. 7 in 1880, No. 8 in 1882,

P

No. 9 in 1884, No. 10 in 1886, No. 11 completing the letter C and vol. 1 in this year), and purchasers on being able at last to bind the book. If future volumes are limited to about 800 pages, they will not remain, as vol. 1 has done, for fourteen years in drawers and cupboards. For one raid that has hitherto been made on this great storehouse of ancient learning, a hundred will be made in future.

J. E. B. M.

Monuments of Classical Antiquity (Denkmäler des Klassischen Altertums zur Erläuterung des Lebens der Griechen und Römer), edited by A. BAUMEISTER. Munich and Leipzig. 1884-87. Vol. I. 26 Mk.

THIS work, which has been little noticed, if at all, in English periodicals, has now reached its 37th part and the article 'Phigalia.' It will be convenient to deal here with parts 1-21 which constitute volume I. and contain the letters A-I. In the absence of any satisfactory Dictionary of Classical Antiquities the appearance of the work is of rather exceptional importance. The *Dictionnaire des Antiquités* of Daremberg and Saglio is indeed an excellent and elaborate book, but though begun in 1873 it has only reached the letter D. The new edition of Smith's *Dictionary of Antiquities* is not likely to be ready for some time, and revised editions of Dr. Smith's other Classical Dictionaries are not even in contemplation. Baumeister's *Monuments* is not, and apparently does not claim to be, a complete Dictionary of Antiquities, but it is so rapidly nearing completion, and its articles (which are lexicographically arranged) deal with so many subjects, that the archaeologist naturally turns to it as a tolerable substitute for a dictionary.

The great feature of the book is the illustrations. The idea seems to have been to bring together in a work of moderate extent and cost reproductions, accompanied by a series of articles, of all the more important ancient monuments that illustrate the Religion, Art and Custom of the Greeks and Romans. The text, though it does not often degenerate into mere 'writing to pictures,' hardly attempts to be exhaustive, for in many cases subjects are dealt with only from the artistic and archaeological standpoints, little reference being made to the information derivable from the literary sources. There is no systematic indication of Bibliography (as there is in Daremberg and Saglio), though most of the articles incidentally furnish a good many references to the literature of the subjects discussed. As a complete bibliography has not been aimed at, it is perhaps hardly necessary to record here such omissions as I have discovered, for instance in the article 'Abraxas' (on Gnostic Gems), where there is a reference to Matter and to an essay by Bellermin, but not to Mr. King's book; and in the article on River-gods ('Flussgötter') where no notice is taken of an important dissertation by Prof. Percy Gardner. Perhaps also the reader may legitimately complain that he is rather too frequently 'sent on' to complete his bibliographical researches in 'Marquardt' and 'Becker-Göll.'

Certain defects in the work appear to arise from an attempt to cover too much ground and, perhaps, from its limits not having been very clearly defined beforehand. The Editor not only admits many of the subjects usually found in Dictionaries of Antiquities but includes Mythology and Iconography, and, at a pinch, Geography and Biography. Besides dissertations on ancient art and custom we find articles on divinities, heroes and mythical person-

ages; articles on the portraiture of emperors, statesmen and poets; an article, mainly topographical, on the city of Athens, and even biographies of the minor sculptors. The Editor seems never to have quite set aside the notion of making his book a complete Dictionary of Antiquities, for he has admitted several articles which are not, and could not well be, illustrated by 'Denkmäler.' Thus, we find short dissertations on Banks and Bankers, on the use of Iron and the Exposing of Children. An almost inevitable result of attempting so much is that several of the articles are too brief and superficial to be of much practical usefulness to students. At the same time, there are in the work many articles of which the solid merit cannot be denied, and one feels grateful for a book that contains so much information not readily accessible elsewhere. The illustrated part of the work is, on the whole, satisfactorily carried out. Many of the monuments, especially the more important works in sculpture, are reproduced by photography. There are numerous engravings and some illustrations in colour. The form of the book is convenient, and the printing and paper are good, thus forming a pleasant contrast to the Lexicons of Roscher and Pauly. Even the archaeologist who has a good library at his command will find Baumeister's 'Monuments' a handy book to cite and to turn to for reference. To ordinary students of Classical Literature and Art who cannot afford and who have no inclination to get together the numerous and costly books which constitute an archaeological library this work may be cordially recommended. Each part costs 1s., which considering the ordinary price of such illustrated books is reasonable.

Among the more elaborate articles in the book may be noted 'Athens' by Dr. Milchhöfer; 'Architecture' ('Baukunst'), 'Sculpture' ('Bildhauerkunst'), 'Erechtheion' and 'Etruscan Antiquities' ('Etrurien') by Dr. Julius; 'Chorus' and 'Choregia' by Dr. B. Arnold; 'Siege-operations' ('Festungskrieg und Geschützwesen') by Dr. A. Müller; 'Flutes and Wind-organs' ('Flöten') by Dr. K. Von Jan; and 'Ilias' and 'Iliupersis' by the Editor.

The mythological articles have been undertaken by Dr. Baumeister himself. This task was, perhaps, almost too much for one man—and that man the editor of a dictionary—to accomplish in an entirely satisfactory manner. Some of the articles (for instance that on Antinoos), might certainly have been worked out more thoroughly; others, however, are fairly elaborate and painstaking. In point of fulness and learning the mythological part of this book cannot compare with Roscher's new Lexicon, though in the number and excellence of its illustrations as well as in its typographical arrangements Baumeister is decidedly ahead of Roscher. There are a few articles which might have been more liberally supplied with illustrations: 'Aphrodite,' 'Erinyen' (which is not illustrated at all), 'Europe,' 'Baumkultus,' 'Flussgötter.' The iconographical articles are interesting and useful, though it is to be regretted that the portrait-coins have been reproduced by engraving and not by photography. Numismatic wood-cutters almost invariably fail to catch likenesses, and Dr. Baumeister's eminent hands are no exception to the rule. Perhaps it might be found possible before the work is completed to furnish the reader with a series of portrait-coins of emperors reproduced by some photographic process. Some of the Greek Imperial coins with heads should also have been reproduced by photography: the engraving, for instance, of the coin of Mitylene accompanying the article 'Alkaios' is poor and misleading. 'Alexander the Great' is well illustrated by photographs, though,

strangely enough, there is no reproduction of his head as it appears on the coins of Lysimachus. With these exceptions, however, the work is well and fully illustrated. Under 'Sculpture' ('Bildhauerkunst') a long series of important monuments is reproduced, and many of the shorter articles are accompanied by interesting illustrations. Thus, under 'Barber' there is a photograph of the quaint terra-cotta group at Berlin of an ancient hair-dresser operating upon his subject. As I have already stated, there are few antiquarian topics which are not treated of in this work; it may be noted however that there is no article 'Contorniates,' and a separate article on 'Hygieia' as well as portrait-coins of Allectus and Carausius might have been included with advantage.

An ideal criticism of so comprehensive a work as Dr. Baumeister's could only be penned by a writer of encyclopaedic knowledge having unlimited columns of the *Classical Review* at his disposal. The present article has, however, I hope indicated with tolerable fairness the principal merits and defects of the first volume of the work. I may perhaps add that my opinion has been formed not only after reading through a large number of the articles, but also after having frequently consulted the book for information on the very numerous and varied 'points' that have to be looked up by one engaged in the study of Greek and Roman Numismatics.

WARWICK WROTH.

Physikalische Geographie von Griechenland—NEUMANN und PARTSCH, Koebner, Breslau, 1885. 9 Mk.

THE Universities of Oxford and Cambridge have recently determined, at the suggestion of the Geographical Society, to establish Readerships in Geography. To all who are interested in this decision I would commend Neumann and Partsch's book as an example of the kind of work which such Readers might do with advantage.

Dr. Partsch has completed and brought up to date the important treatise on the physical geography of Greece which was the work of his teacher and predecessor, Dr. Neumann. The scheme of the book, and the leading ideas belong to Neumann; but his pupil deserves immense credit for the conscientious labour which he has devoted to its completion in detail. This is not one of those airy handbooks which give you a little art, a little history and a few commonplaces about the effect of climate upon the temper. It is a serious work, a perfect mine of facts and references; a mine, too, of ideas. Its aim is stated by Neumann in his admirable introduction to be the systematic exhibition of the physical features of Greece and their influence upon national character and institutions in ancient times. The definiteness and moderation with which he lays down the limits of his subject contrast strongly with the vague and ill-proportioned claims by which Buckle and other writers have made the name of physical environment unpopular in England. The body of the book is divided into five chapters, dealing with the climate of Greece, the relation of land and sea, the conformation of the land, its geology, and its vegetation. In the last two chapters, which form rather more than half the book, the classical reader will be chiefly interested in the sections that describe the influence of limestone rocks upon the worship of Poseidon, and of the connection between the cultivation of corn and the festivals of Athene. It appears that the cultus of Poseidon is only found in districts which are distinguished either by the presence of *barathra* or by the frequent occurrence of earthquakes.

But it is not only in these chapters that light is thrown upon myths and religious ceremonies. Researches of that kind form one of the most interesting features of the book; and their inductive method and moderate tone make them convincing as well as agreeable reading.

Another valuable part of the book is the analysis of the mountain system. No one who has not made a study of Greek geography can realise the difficulties of getting a clear conception of the structure of Actolia and Arcadia. No existing map (not even the Vienna map) throws much light upon it: most of them represent it as mere confusion. But the third chapter of this book makes the reader feel that there is order in the seeming chaos, and that a map might show it. The same chapter states with admirable clearness and impartiality the political results of the country's peculiar formation. It contains little that is absolutely new: but its completeness and philosophical tone may make it welcome as a compendium even to those who are familiar with its doctrines.

But the book has one serious fault. It is undeniably dull, both in style and in arrangement. Gratitude for much information cannot blind the reader to the fact that a catalogue of trees which fills a hundred pages is excessive when thirty are found sufficient for the mountains. And catalogues are too prominent in other parts; while those single instances, by which many writers at once relieve and illustrate a long argument, are strangely wanting. Dr. Neumann's style is clear and often forcible, but it lacks brightness and variety. Dr. Partsch is neither clear nor forcible. And neither style gains by the arrangement which presents them in a kind of irregular sandwich. But, despite its faults, this is a book which no student of Greek history can afford to neglect.

M. G. GLAZEBROOK.

The Story of the Nations: Alexander's Empire. By J. P. MAHAFFY, D.D. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 5s.

EVEN if this book were much less cleverly put together than it is, it would be impossible for a critic to withhold his sympathy from the author. He has undertaken to write a story without a plot, and with hardly any unity of scene or of national character. He repeatedly betrays his own discomfort under these trying circumstances, by explaining and apologising for omissions and curtailments. He has to tell something reluctantly of wars and quarrels which carry little human interest with them, and lead only to results which were soon in their turn obliterated; and he has to cut short chapters evidently written *con amore*, where his wide reading and great knowledge of antiquity must have often tempted him to pause and talk at leisure to his readers. His progress through the two centuries that followed Alexander's conquests must have been a somewhat dreary one, and we seem to see signs in the latter part of the book that he was glad to get to the end of it.

It may be useful to give a brief indication of the contents of a book which in 300 pages covers so long and complicated a period of history. The story of Alexander's conquests is compressed into forty pages, with plans of his three great battles; brief as the account is, it is full of suggestive comment, and the only thing wanting seems to be some explanation of the way in which the notion of a great attack on Persia, which originated in Greece, was transferred to Philip, and through him to Alexander; Isokrates is not even mentioned. Seven chapters follow, on the period of the Diadochi, and these are some of the best in the book. The two figures of greatest human interest,

Demetrius and Eumenes, are handled (the former especially), with due appreciation of the importance of their lives by Plutarch; we have two or three interesting pages upon Hellenistic city life, and wish for more, for we do not learn anything about the method of government of these cities, nor does the author make it clear to us (see p. 95), whether he agrees with Droysen or Grote as to the number of foundations attributed to Alexander and his successors. A brief sketch of the philosophy of this period, given in chapter xi., is written in Dr. Mahaffy's most lively and original style, and the strange contrast of Aristotle's political thinking and his great pupil's political actions is skilfully touched. Leaving the Diadochi, the author faces the most difficult part of his task with surprising coolness, and the chapter on 'the three young kings' is a model of the art of marshalling complicated facts in a very short space; it is followed by a valuable chapter, one of those which must have greatly tempted its writer to give himself rein, on the *litterati* and scientists of Alexandria. Thence we pass to the further history of the three great kingdoms, to the age of the Achaean League, the reign of Philip V., and the first interference of Rome in Greece and the East, where the young reader will find himself once more on ground with which he is tolerably familiar. In this last part of the book it must be confessed that even Dr. Mahaffy has not always been able to make the narrative perfectly lucid or really interesting; but he has probably done all that could well be done in the space allowed him. The chapters on Pergamon and Rhodes, and on the influence of Hellenism on Rome, contribute some relief to the rapid narrative of events.

The book is copiously illustrated with maps, and cuts of statues and coins; and the only real blemish I have found is on p. 50, where a strange blunder has been committed which the author must have already noticed. It is all the more to be regretted that we are occasionally offended by faults of taste, which betray a tendency to loose historical thinking, and a desire to make the book readable by means which a judicious writer would on second thoughts reject.

W. W. FOWLER.

The Story of the Nations: Carthage. By Professor A. J. CHURCH. T. Fisher Unwin. 5s.

PROFESSOR CHURCH has used his story-telling powers to great advantage in this excellent little book. It is a melancholy tale of continuous defeat and disaster, but by going to the original authorities, and selecting from them what best suits his purpose, he has contrived to make it really interesting. Even an unpretentious book, written for young readers, gains greatly by being the work of a scholar; and this one has also the advantage of numerous cuts of Carthaginian coins and monuments, together with plans of Carthage, Utica, &c. and a rough but pleasant-looking map of the Carthaginian empire. A good map of Sicily might well have been added.

The author has wisely broken the long record of the campaigns which constitute almost all we know of Carthaginian history by three short but useful and interesting chapters on the discoveries, the constitution, and the trade of Carthage, the first of which contains a translation, with geographical notes, of the *Periplus* of Hanno. In the second, as indeed throughout the book, he has carefully steered clear of all controversy, in order to give as clear an outline as possible of the really salient facts. This is by no means an easy matter, in a history bristling, like that of Carthage, with points of doubt and controversy; but the result is quite successful. Incidentally it is interesting to note that Professor Church (in spite of Mommsen) accepts the date 509 B.C. for the first treaty with Rome, following Polybius, for whom he evidently has a great liking; that he takes Hannibal over the Alps by the Little St. Bernard, and has not become a convert to Mr. Freshfield, and the Durance theory (here again he follows Polybius rather than Livy); and that he places the battle-field of Trasimenus (rightly perhaps) to the *west* of the long defile under the hills.

The book may be heartily recommended to readers of all orders and ages. It brings together in a single volume of 300 pages some of the most vital and interesting events in the history of Phoenicians, Greeks, and Romans, and tells the story of the world with much skill in arrangement, and in perfectly simple language.

W. W. F.

NOTES.

ÆSCHYL. *Agam.* 301.

πλέον καίονσα τῶν εἰρημένων.

Mr. Paley translates the words τῶν εἰρημένων 'than those hitherto described.' Others have thought the line in some way corrupt. But why may it not mean 'than what had been commanded?' τὰ εἰρημένα is found in this sense in Soph. *Antig.* 215 ὥς ἂν σκοποὶ νῦν ἦτε τῶν εἰρημένων. The poet, wishing to describe the eagerness with which the watchmen carried out their orders in transmitting the glad intelligence by means of a fire, says that they kindled a bigger fire than had been ordered.—ALEX. PALLIS.

ARIST. *Ach.* 100. The following note has been communicated to me: 'That the words of the ambassador must belong to some real language has been recognised by most scholars; we should have expected them to be Old Persian, but the attempts at explaining them from that language by the eminent authorities Brockhaus and Spiegel (see W. Ribbeck's edition) are obvious failures. I do not know whether it has been noticed that the verse with (practically) no alterations will translate as old Sanskrit; we may thus transliterate

ιαρταμαν εξαοξαν απισσωνα πατρα

(the reading of most MSS., see A. Müller's note)

iyarti mādā sarvā na pīṣṭva satrā

'mittit me Xerxes, o scelerate, nequaquam.' Each of these words, with the exception of *sarvā* (a proper name), may be verified with the aid of Grassmann's Concordance from the Rig-Veda:

iyarti, Gr. col. 99.

pīṣṭva, Gr. col. 819; frequent in later Sanskrit.

na-satrā, 'not at all,' Gr. col. 1454; na vindāmi satrā, 'I can by no means find!'

Ἰεσπας 355. μέμνησαι δὴθ' ὅτ' ἐπὶ στρατιᾷς κλέψας ποτὲ τοὺς ὀβελίσκους

ἴεις σαυτὸν κατὰ τοῦ τείχους.

On the nature of these ὀβελίσκοι and the object of stealing them, the commentators (Richter, Mitchell, Green) offer no suggestions; Voss (1821) renders the word by 'Bratspiesschen.' Müller-Strübing, A.H.K. p. 615, 599, notices the difficulty and suggests ὀβελίτας, a reading apparently represented by the 'Spiesskuchen' of Droysen, ed. 3.—I am inclined to think that a passage of Diodorus (xix, 45, 4) may throw some light on the passage in the *Ἰεσπας*: εὐθὺς (at the flooding of Rhodes) τὰ ταπεινὰ τῆς πόλεως ἐπ' ἀγροῦτο, τῶν μὲν ὀχετῶν διὰ τὸ δοκεῖν παρελθῆναι τὸν χειμῶνα, κατημελημένων, τῶν δ' ἐν τοῖς τεί-

χεσιν ὀβελισκῶν συμπραχθέντων. What were these ὀβελισκοί, which Rhodomannus renders *tubi murorum*, but which Wesseling fancied to be a kind of grating?—D. S. M.

ARISTOTELIAN FRAGMENTS.—The *Times* of April 27 has the following from Vienna: 'It is reported from Philippopolis that M. Petros Papageorgiu, a Greek scholar residing in that city, has discovered an ancient manuscript, containing passages of Aristotle's works. The manuscript is believed to be of the fourteenth century, and consists of 180 pages, which comprise the following extracts:—Pages 1 to 76, four books of *Περὶ Οὐρανῶν*, 'On the Heavens;' pages 77 to 124, two books of *Περὶ Γενέσεως καὶ Φθορᾶς*, 'On Generation and Corruption;' pages 125 to 178, the first three books of *Περὶ Ψυχῆς*, 'On the Soul;' pages 179 and 180, an extract of *Περὶ σοφιστικῶν ἑλέγχων*.'

The manuscript is in excellent preservation, the vellum being clean and strong, and all the letters being perfectly legible. It bears marginal annotations which are probably of the fifteenth century. M. Papageorgiu is now comparing the manuscript with existing editions of Aristotle's works, and he finds that the text differs in many important passages from these editions, and notably from Didot's, which is in general use on the Continent. This is the more interesting, as the manuscript gives extracts only from the genuine Aristotelian collection, and not from any works which commentators have agreed to regard as spurious. As soon as M. Papageorgiu has finished his collating he will publish a pamphlet giving the result of his researches.'

STRĪTAUOS (Fest); TRĪTAUOS.—How is the difference of these two forms of the same word to be explained? Initial *str-* is very common in Latin: therefore it is not likely that the absence of the *s* is due to mere phonetic loss.

May we postulate,

(1) The word would hardly ever be used except in the list of words denoting relationship (e.g. Plautus, *Persa* 57. *pater auos proauos abauos atauos tritauos*).

(2) The second is a larger postulate, and, if true, has much larger issues. Final *s* in Latin was regularly weak—*how* weak it is probably impossible to say, and it doubtless varied. It seems likely that it was heard least before a voiced consonant, somewhat

more before a vowel, and before a voiceless consonant as *t*. Inscriptions and the fragments of the oldest poets are not conclusive evidence on this point: they slightly confirm the suggestion, so far as they can be used.

If these two postulates be granted, we may argue:

A. If *tritauos* be the original form, then by rapid pronunciation — *proauosabaunosatauositritauos*, the *s* from *atauos* being heard somewhat distinctly before *t* might attach itself to the word *tritauos* and give a form *stritauos*, just as 'an ewt' in English made 'a newt.'

B. If on the other hand *stritauos* were original, the *s* might attach itself to *atauo*, and leave *tritauos*: as 'a nadder' left 'an adder.'

As to meaning, if *tritauos* be original, it is possible that the apparent meaning was once the real one, when the point from which the reckoning began was still consciously held. *Tritos* may be old Italian for *tertius*, which has not an original look: *trī* would stand between *trei* (in *tre(i)-es*, *tres*) and *trī* in *τρίτος*, on Osthoff's 'nebentonige Tiefstufe' theory. If on the other hand *stritauos* is original, the meaning is wholly dark, and probably was so to an Italian; and the new form *tritauos* would commend itself to the 'popular etymologist' of the day, by its apparent possibility of meaning.—JOHN PEILE.

THE last number of the *Greyfriar*, a Charterhouse illustrated magazine, contains a charming version of Catullus on 'Lesbia's Sparrow' by Mr. G. S. Davies. It is happily turned in the Scots' dialect, that 'kindly Doric,' which, like its Greek prototype, lends itself so well both to humour and pathos. If we are ever to see the 'hundred best versions,' this might very well claim a place among them. The last two stanzas run thus:

'The wee thing's gane the shadowy road
That's never travelled back by ony:
Out on ye, Shades! ye're greedy aye
To grab at aught that's brave and bonny.

'Puir, foolish, fondling bonnie bird,
Ye little ken what wark ye're leavin';
Ye've gar'd my lassie's een grow red,
Those bonnie een grow red wi' grievin'.'

I should be much obliged if any reader of the *Classical Review* would tell me where I might find a complete list of the commentaries, especially the patristic and modern German, on the different books of the Bible.—M. A.

CLASSICAL EDUCATION IN FRANCE.

(Letter from a French University Professor.)

MONSIEUR,

La lettre par laquelle vous avez bien voulu m'inviter à entretenir les lecteurs de la *Classical Review* des études classiques en France me propose d'abord un programme bien vaste, et bien fait pour intimider un plus hardi que moi. Mais dans ce cercle si large vous en tracez aussitôt un plus étroit qu'il sera moins difficile de remplir. Vous m'indiquez un premier sujet et me posez sur ce sujet une série de questions si précises et si bien entendues, que je ne saurais faire mieux que d'essayer d'y répondre point par point. Vous désirez, dites-vous, "a clear exposition of the training undergone by your best classical scholars; what age they go to school, what are the hours of study, what are the usual books, what attention is given to composition both in Greek and Latin, what is the nature of the examinations, how far the instruction given at college is distinct from that given at school, and in fact anything that would enable an

Englishman to picture to himself the course of classical education in France, and to form some opinion of the advantages or disadvantages which your system may have over ours. I should further be very much obliged if you would let me know whether there has been much change in your system of late years." Il y a là, si je vois bien, quatre points principaux à traiter: I. l'enseignement secondaire; II. les examens; III. l'enseignement supérieur; IV. les réformes et les courants d'opinion.

I.

A ce que vous appelez *school* correspondent chez nous des établissements de différentes sortes:—

1^o Les établissements d'instruction secondaire officiels, placés sous la direction du Ministre de l'Instruction publique, les lycées et les collèges. Les lycées sont fondés, ou du moins administrés et entretenus par l'État; les collèges—qui n'ont aucun rapport avec vos *colleges* anglais, veuillez bien retenir

ce point une fois pour toutes—appartiennent aux communes, et sont à leur charge, en grande partie. Les programmes, les méthodes d'enseignement, l'esprit qui règnent dans ces deux genres d'établissements sont les mêmes. Il y a d'excellents collèges; mais en général, le lycée est considéré comme supérieur; il a le premier choix des maîtres et dispose de ressources plus considérables.

2° Les petits séminaires et les institutions dirigées par des ecclésiastiques. Les petits séminaires sont fondés par l'Eglise catholique, placés sous la direction exclusive du clergé, et destinés à préparer aux grands séminaires, qui forment les prêtres. Mais bien des élèves de petits séminaires, soit qu'ils entrent dans les ordres, soit qu'au dernier moment ils ne se sentent pas de vocation, poursuivent les études classiques afin de se consacrer à l'enseignement. Les institutions catholiques dirigées par des ecclésiastiques étaient pour la plupart aux mains des jésuites avant l'expulsion de cet ordre, en 1880; elles ont passé alors en d'autres mains—pour la forme, disent certaines gens, tandis que d'autres assurent que le changement a été réel, et non à l'avantage de ces maisons.

3° Les établissements libres et non religieux. Ils sont relativement peu nombreux et de valeur très inégale. Il y a de tout, depuis les entreprises purement industrielles, les institutions qui ne visent qu'à faire arriver aux examens par la voie la plus rapide, fût-elle la plus stupide—les *fours à bachelot*, en argot de collégiens—jusqu'à des écoles modèles, fondées expressément en vue d'inaugurer des méthodes d'enseignement nouvelles, ou de perfectionner les anciennes; je nommerai par exemple l'Ecole Monge et l'Ecole alsacienne à Paris.

La jeunesse française est très inégalement répartie entre ces différentes sortes d'établissements. Les deux grandes masses sont les lycées et les collèges d'une part, les établissements religieux de l'autre. Les institutions libres non religieuses sont numériquement peu considérables. Les jeunes gens enfin qui reçoivent toute leur instruction dans le sein de leur famille peuvent à peine compter, tant ils sont rares.

Je pourrai revenir, à l'occasion, sur les caractères distinctifs de chaque espèce d'établissements. Pour aujourd'hui, permettez, en vue de la brièveté et de la clarté, que je prenne pour type de l'enseignement classique en France l'enseignement officiel par excellence, celui du lycée. Il est d'ailleurs permis d'affirmer, sans méconnaître les mérites d'autres institutions, que la majorité des élèves les plus distingués vient des lycées; et c'est des plus distingués que vous voulez m'entendre parler.

Les lycées sont de vastes établissements, réunissant jusqu'à 1000, 1500 et même 2000 élèves. Ils ont presque tous une forte proportion d'élèves internes, et offrent, à côté de l'enseignement classique, un enseignement dit spécial, destiné à préparer aux carrières commerciales, industrielles, &c.; des classes préparatoires aux Ecoles Polytechnique, de St. Cyr, &c. L'enseignement classique est réparti en trois divisions: division élémentaire, de 7 à 10 ans; division de grammaire, de 11 à 13 ans; division supérieure, de 14 à 17 ans. Le programme de la division élémentaire est à peu près celui des écoles primaires les plus développées, avec l'étude d'une langue vivante en plus (allemand ou anglais). On y fait des exercices de lecture, de citation, on apprend la grammaire française, le calcul, l'histoire de France, la géographie, et un peu d'histoire naturelle.

C'est avec la division de grammaire, que commencent à proprement parler les études classiques. On y consacre, en moyenne, 3 heures par semaine au français, 10 à 12 aux langues anciennes, 2 aux langues vivantes, 2 à l'histoire, 1 à la géographie, 2 au calcul

et à l'histoire naturelle. Il y a classe cinq fois par semaine de 8 à 10 heures et de 2 à 4. Le jeudi est libre. Le dessin et les leçons facultatives, religion, musique, &c., sont en dehors des 20 heures réglementaires. On commence le latin en 6^e, le grec en 5^e. Les langues vivantes, le calcul, l'histoire naturelle, et, en 4^e, l'histoire et la géographie sont enseignés par des maîtres spéciaux, le français et les langues anciennes, de plus l'histoire et la géographie en 6^e et 5^e, sont confiés à un maître pour chaque classe.

La division supérieure est formée de trois classes de lettres, dans lesquelles se poursuit l'étude des langues anciennes, et d'une classe de philosophie, où elle est remplacée par un cours de psychologie, de logique, de morale, &c. En même temps, les mathématiques et les sciences physiques et naturelles, au lieu de 3 heures qu'elles avaient jusque là, en obtiennent 8. Dans les classes de lettres, le français, le latin et le grec disposent du nombre d'heures suivant: 3, 5, 5 en 3^e; 3, 4, 5 en 2^e; 4, 4, 4 en rhétorique.

Mais voilà bien assez de chiffres. Il les fallait, pour former le cadre dans lequel je vais essayer enfin d'esquisser un tableau des études qui vous intéressent particulièrement. Prenons un enfant qui entrerait en 6^e au mois d'octobre, et suivons-le par la pensée jusqu'à la sortie du lycée, en 1894; supposons, par impossible, que ces sept ans se passent sans réforme; nous pourrions nous faire une idée des résultats obtenus par le système d'études actuel.

Dès la fin de la première année, notre élève saura les déclinaisons et les conjugaisons latines, ainsi que les règles de syntaxe les plus indispensables. Nous n'avons guère en France qu'une grammaire, c'est celle de Lhomond. On l'a rhabillée de bien des manières, on lui a substitué des manuels faits "d'après la méthode historique" ou "comparative"; mais on ne l'a pas remplacée. Le professeur fait acheter à ses élèves la grammaire de M. Chassang, Inspecteur général, et la leur fait apprendre par cœur, mais lui-même enseigne d'après Lhomond, qui est pour lui la grammaire, tandis que Chassang est une grammaire. Lhomond a si bien su mouler sa méthode sur nos cerveaux—à moins que, depuis cent ans, nos cerveaux ne se soient moulés sur sa méthode—que l'on ne prévoit pas comment nous nous affranchirons jamais de son autorité. Le faut-il d'ailleurs absolument? De bons esprits ne le pensent pas; et il est certain que si nous réussissions à introduire dans nos lycées un livre tel que par exemple l'Abrégé de grammaire latine de M. Louis Havet, joignant aux éminentes qualités pédagogiques de Lhomond les qualités scientifiques qui lui manquent absolument, nous aurions un instrument d'éducation classique vraiment enviable. On apprend donc le latin par Lhomond; c'est à dire qu'on l'apprend en vue de l'écriture, et d'une manière pratique et rapide. La matière grammaticale, si je puis ainsi dire, est réduite au minimum, et des éléments de syntaxe sont mêlés aux éléments de morphologie à mesure qu'ils deviennent nécessaires pour pouvoir former de petites phrases latines. Aussi, au bout de peu de jours, notre jeune lycéen fera de petits thèmes, c'est à dire des traductions du français en latin. Il fera beaucoup de thèmes écrits, qui étaient les seuls autrefois, et aussi des thèmes oraux, c'est à dire des exercices de traduction de vive voix et improvisée, sous la direction du professeur. C'est l'exercice que les Allemands appellent *extemporalia*. Ces thèmes oraux, le professeur peut les inventer; souvent il préfère les prendre tout faits dans des recueils composés *ad hoc*. On ne tarde pas à joindre au thème la version, c'est à dire la traduction écrite de textes latins. Le thème et la version alterneront jusqu'en quatrième, ce sont les devoirs par excellence.

Mais la version prendra toujours plus de place à mesure que notre élève montera de classe en classe, et finira par la prendre toute, ou presque toute. Cet exercice forme, si je ne me trompe, le trait distinctif de notre enseignement classique. Car tel qu'on le pratique, en accordant une importance pour le moins aussi grande à l'art de la traduction qu'à l'intelligence du texte, il est une véritable école de style. C'est l'école où se sont formés nos plus grands écrivains, puisque l'idée d'exercer les élèves à écrire en français sur un sujet donné est une idée toute récente. Les versions sont généralement dictées par le professeur, parce qu'il les emprunte tantôt à un auteur, tantôt à un autre. Il y a là un avantage, c'est que les élèves prennent au moins quelque idée des auteurs qu'on n'étudie pas en classe d'une manière suivie ; et un inconvénient, c'est que l'élément divinatoire, qui entre dans toute interprétation, prend ici une trop grande importance. Il va sans dire qu'il existe des recueils de morceaux choisis pour servir de versions, avec la traduction, si l'on veut. De vive voix, on explique en 6^e un petit livre dû également à Lhomond, intitulé *De Viris illustribus urbis Romae*. Il est intéressant, approprié à l'âge des élèves ; mais il a l'inconvénient de tous les livres de ce genre faits par les modernes : bien que composé de lambeaux d'auteurs anciens, le latin n'en est pas pur, ni même toujours correct. C'est d'autant plus regrettable qu'on apprend beaucoup de ce latin par cœur à un âge où les leçons se gravent dans la mémoire pour toujours. En 5^e, le *De Viris* sera remplacé par Phèdre, Cornélius Nepos (douze à quinze vies) et Ovide (morceaux choisis, la valeur d'un livre, au plus). En 4^e, on passera à Quinte-Curce, César et Virgile (*Enéide* I. et II.).

À tous ces exercices, on en a joint un autre, très usité autrefois pour le grec, qui consiste à apprendre par cœur des mots groupés soit d'après le sens, soit d'après l'étymologie. C'est une bonne chose, assurément, mais qui serait meilleure encore si l'on avait pris soin de puiser ces mots, pour chaque classe, dans les textes qu'on y étudie. En général, dans cet enseignement élémentaire du latin, les exercices ne sont pas assez liés entre eux. Il existe, à vrai dire, certains cours de thèmes qui suivent la grammaire de paragraphe en paragraphe. On a publié aussi quelques recueils de thèmes d'imitation, dans lesquels l'élève est appelé à employer les mots et les tours qu'il vient de rencontrer dans les textes. C'est un progrès. Mais entre la grammaire et les textes, il n'y a toujours aucun rapport de progression commune, et le plus souvent chaque genre d'exercices suit sa marche à part et isolée : grammaire, thèmes, versions, explication, mots latins. Inutile d'insister sur la perte de temps et d'efforts qui en résulte.

On commence le grec dans le courant de la seconde année (classe de 5^e), et déjà à la fin de la troisième (classe de 4^e) notre élève aura parcouru toute la grammaire. À mesure qu'il apprendra la déclinaison et la conjugaison dites régulières (en 5^e), il emploiera ces premières connaissances à traduire de petites phrases composées et ordonnées à cet effet dans une chrestomathie. Tout en achevant le cours de grammaire (en 4^e), il abordera Lucien et Xénophon. C'est pendant cette année presque exclusivement que se font des exercices de traduction du français en grec. Pour le grec, on pratique peut-être plus que pour le latin le thème d'imitation. Si, en une année, il n'est pas possible de pousser bien loin, il y a pourtant des professeurs qui à force de zèle et de talent font assez avancer leurs élèves pour que dans les trois années suivantes ils pussent arriver à savoir le grec très passablement s'ils continuaient à l'étudier de la bonne manière. À bien des égards, nos professeurs

corrigent ce que nos programmes ont de défectueux. Mais à tout il y a une limite.

C'est aussi en 4^e surtout qu'on s'applique à fixer le vocabulaire dans la mémoire des élèves. Nos pères et les plus avancés de notre génération se sont servis à cet effet du jardin des racines grecques de Lancelot. Ce livre, bien démodé, avec son choix de mots peu judicieux et ses vers mnémotechniques, est aujourd'hui remplacé par des recueils beaucoup plus conformes aux exigences de la science, comme p. ex. la *Clef du vocabulaire grec* de M. Tournier ou les *Mots grecs* de MM. Bréal et Bailly, mais moins pratiques aussi, surtout au point de vue de la mémoire. Quelle qu'en soit la cause, le fait est que, au sortir des études secondaires, on possède en général fort peu de mots grecs.

En entrant dans les classes de lettres, l'élève est censé connaître assez la grammaire latine et grecque pour n'avoir plus qu'à revoir la première pendant une année, la seconde pendant deux ans. Le thème est maintenu au programme de la 3^e et de la 2^e ; la composition latine apparaît dans le programme de rhétorique (c'est ainsi qu'on nomme la 1^{re} classe) ; dans la réalité, depuis que la composition latine ne figure plus à l'examen du baccalauréat, ces exercices ont beaucoup de peine à vivre, surtout en seconde et en rhétorique. Il faut que le professeur possède une grande autorité et fasse de grands efforts pour obtenir que même seulement l'élite des élèves s'y applique sérieusement. Ce ne sont plus guère que les futurs candidats à l'École normale qui apprennent à écrire en latin dans quelques lycées de Paris où l'on redouble sa rhétorique à cet effet. Ce qu'on a ôté à la composition latine, on a cru l'ajouter à l'étude des auteurs ; les programmes, de ce côté, sont d'une richesse exubérante. À Virgile, commencé en 4^e et qui s'achève en rhétorique, s'ajoutent, de classe en classe, Tite-Live (3^e décade), Salluste, les lettres de Plinius, plusieurs discours et petits traités philosophiques de Cicéron, puis Horace tout entier, Tacite (Agricola, et 8 livres des Annales et des Histoires), enfin une pièce de Térence et des extraits de Lucrèce. Il semble que notre élève sortira du lycée familiarisé avec tous les chefs d'œuvre de la littérature latine. Malheureusement, dans le temps consacré au latin, il n'est pas possible de parcourir tout ce programme. Pour en voir au moins le plus possible, on recommande beaucoup la lecture dite cursive des auteurs. Bon nombre de professeurs, et des meilleurs, la considèrent comme peu utile ; et il est certain qu'elle ne peut l'être qu'à trois conditions ; il faut que les élèves aient déjà acquis une certaine sûreté dans le maniement de la langue, qui ne s'obtient guère qu'en écrivant en latin ; il faut que cette lecture cursive soit précédée de l'étude approfondie d'une bonne partie de l'ouvrage qu'on parcourt ensuite d'un pas plus rapide ; il faut enfin qu'on ait le temps d'en faire beaucoup, de lire plusieurs chants de Virgile, plusieurs livres de Tite-Live, &c. Le fait est qu'aujourd'hui, si les élèves voient un peu plus d'auteurs qu'autrefois, ils n'en sont pas plus habiles à les lire à livre ouvert, ils le sont moins, parce que, sur ce point comme sur d'autres, dans les récentes réformes, on a voulu le but sans vouloir les moyens. Nous sommes en train d'apprendre par expérience ce que nous n'avons pas voulu croire quand les voix les plus autorisées du Conseil supérieur nous l'ont dit, c'est que l'on n'arrive pas à lire le latin sans l'écrire. La version est plus indépendante de la connaissance grammaticale de la langue que l'explication orale ; et cependant même la version latine baisse ; les Facultés l'ont constaté à plusieurs reprises aux examens du baccalauréat. Chez vous, la composition latine est encore en honneur. Ne vous la laissez pas enlever si vous

tenez à sauver l'étude sérieuse et vraiment profitable des auteurs.

L'écart entre la hauteur du programme et le niveau qu'atteignent les élèves est plus forte encore en grec, parce que le thème grec ne franchit même pas le seuil de la 3^{me}. Xénophon, Hérodote, Plutarque, Platon, Démosthène, Homère, Euripide, Sophocle et Aristophane sont déchiffrés, le plus souvent à l'aide de traductions, par des élèves qui sont à peine de force à comprendre vraiment un dialogue de Lucien.

Si l'on ne peut pas dire que l'étude personnelle des auteurs anciens traverse en ce moment une période de prospérité (car tout n'est pas perdu, heureusement ; on reviendra à des vues plus saines, il faut l'espérer), en revanche notre jeune ami ne quittera pas les bancs du lycée sans connaître au moins l'époque où ces auteurs ont vécu, le titre et le sujet de leurs principaux écrits, sans avoir, en un mot, une idée générale des littératures classiques. "Le professeur," dit le programme, "sans faire un cours suivi d'histoire littéraire, s'attachera à propos de l'explication des auteurs et de la correction des devoirs, à mettre en lumière les caractères essentiels de la littérature des principales époques, à marquer la filiation des grandes œuvres et à indiquer la place occupée par les genres secondaires." Ce programme est en général fort bien rempli. Il répond au goût prononcé des professeurs et des élèves pour tout ce que l'on a coutume de comprendre aujourd'hui sous le nom de critique littéraire, et qui peut former un élément précieux d'une bonne éducation classique.

On a fait aussi des livres d'après ce programme ; mais comme ils servent plus encore aux jeunes étudiants qu'aux lycéens, il sera plus convenable d'y revenir à propos de l'enseignement supérieur. Disons plutôt un mot ici des éditions classiques d'auteurs anciens. En général, elles sont de qualité très inférieure. Fabriquées sur commande et à la hâte par des hommes nullement préparés à cette tâche difficile, elles présentent le plus souvent des textes pris au hasard, des notes cueillies ci et là, au hasard aussi, ou tracées au courant de la plume, d'après l'inspiration du moment. Les meilleurs de ces produits sont encore les plus malhonnêtes : ce sont les contrefaçons plus ou moins déguisées de quelque édition allemande, Teubner ou Weidmann. J'ai hâte d'ajouter que si une fâcheuse concurrence entre libraires inonde le marché de ces articles de

pacotille, nous commençons à avoir un petit stock d'éditions classiques d'une tout autre qualité, faites par des savants compétents, familiarisés préalablement avec leur auteur, et sachant ce qu'il faut de temps, de peine, de soin, de méditation, de science et de conscience pour faire une édition classique passable. C'est ainsi que nous possédons, pour le grec, un Manuel d'Épictète, par Thurot, qui est, dans sa simplicité élémentaire, un petit chef d'œuvre ; plusieurs discours de Démosthène et plusieurs pièces d'Euripide par M. Henri Weil ; un Sophocle de M. Tournier ; deux vies de Plutarque, par Ch. Graux ; en latin, plusieurs livres de Tite-Live par M. Benoist et Riemann ; les mêmes par M. Harant ; des discours de Cicéron par M. Émile Thomas ; un autre par M. Gantrelle ; les Histoires de Tacite par le même, &c., &c. Nommons encore, comme ayant donné l'exemple, le Virgile de M. Benoist. Vous trouveriez sans doute les notes de la plupart de ces éditions un peu laconiques, comme vous l'avez dit à propos du *De Signis* de M. Thomas (ci-dessus No. 3, p. 72). Pour nos élèves, nous serons bien contents s'ils font leur profit de ce qui leur est offert sous cette forme concise, s'ils ne trouvent dans des livres destinés à leur servir de guides, ni grossières erreurs, ni vagues banalités, et nous nous félicitons en tous cas de voir entre leurs mains des textes convenablement constitués.

Je n'ai rien dit encore de la versification latine, et je n'ai pas grand chose à en dire. On ne fait plus de vers latins au lycée. Cet exercice avait fini par prendre trop d'importance, mais il avait une grande utilité ; il faisait apprendre la prosodie, et il rendait l'élève sensible au charme du vers de Virgile. On l'a remplacé par des notions sur le vers iambique, données à propos de Phèdre, en 5^e, sur l'hexamètre, à propos d'Ovide et de Virgile, en 4^e, enfin sur les principaux mètres lyriques d'Horace, en 3^e. Malheureusement, au sortir du lycée il ne reste guère de traces de ces notions qui, à cause de la différence trop grande entre la versification française et celle des Latins, ne peuvent faire comprendre l'effet musical du mètre. Les odes d'Horace et les églogues de Virgile ne sont pour nos élèves qu'une sorte de prose poétique. Aussi sommes-nous saisis d'un étonnement mêlé de respect quand nous voyons paraître dans vos colonnes des pièces de vers non seulement latins, mais grecs !

(To be continued.)

UNIVERSITY INTELLIGENCE.

OXFORD.

CONGREGATION has decided that Bodleian books are not to be lent, unless by decree of Convocation. But the discussion on a subsequent amendment seemed to show that there would be no insuperable objection to the temporary loan of books to University officials at the Museum and other University institutions, which would suffer considerably from an absolute denial of the right to borrow.

The Modern Language School is not yet started, but the statute will probably pass. It would be as well, however, if the word 'Literature' could be struck out wherever it occurs : the subject is inadequately represented on the board of studies, and the philological side of the examination is so over-weighted as to leave little chance for the other departments. It may have been well to include the languages of the north and east of Europe in the scheme : but English is unduly hampered with Gothic, even if Anglo-Saxon be absolutely neces-

sary :—our literature owes nothing to Gothic, whatever the language may owe : and it is difficult to see why Greek should not be as indispensable from a literary point of view, as Gothic from the linguistic standpoint.

Mr. H. F. Pelham has been appointed Reader in Ancient History, and will probably keep up the tradition of what has hitherto been the most successful of all our readerships. Convocation has, for the first time in our recollection, thrown out a proposed grant of money to the Museum. The work, it was shown, is already being done by two colleges, and the University has no money to spend, even for necessary purposes. Nobody wishes to starve the Museum : but the possibility of an adverse vote will tend to make a smaller grant go further, and to check the idea that double provision for single needs is indispensable.

CAMBRIDGE.

The Committee formed for the introduction of the reformed pronunciation of Latin have considered the answers to their circular, which show that no material difficulty has been felt in the experiment. They accordingly recommend that the scheme of pronunciation set forth in their syllabus be generally adopted by the teachers of Classics in Cambridge, at least in the teaching of candidates for honours beginning with the ensuing Michaelmas term.

The class list of the Classical Tripos, Part I., has not unnaturally excited much interest. It has fallen out that amongst the undergraduates of a weak year no one was found to deserve a place in the first division of the first class. But in the list of the

women who have passed the same examination Miss A. F. Ramsay, Girton, appears alone in the first division of the first class. She may therefore be regarded as Senior Classic, in spite of the change of system introduced six years ago with a view to substitute for the old order of merit, divisions or 'brackets' in alphabetical order. It should be remembered, however, that the Craven scholar for the year was not in the competition, he having already passed in the second division of the first class in 1886, at the end of his sixth term.

Mr. G. Tilley, of King's, has been appointed University Lecturer in Roman History.

(For Examinations see page 215.)

ARCHÆOLOGY.

BRITISH MUSEUM.—The Museum has acquired a Greek gem of onyx in the form of a scarabæus, representing a warrior (possibly Achilles) seated and holding two spears in his left hand with his helmet and shield beside him. It is a delicate piece of engraving of the early part of the fifth century. The Museum has also acquired a circular leaden tablet for attachment by four nails to some object from which it has been wrenched. It is inscribed in Greek with the names of three freedmen, and dates from Roman times. It was found at the ancient Nervia near Bordighera. The Museum has, however, failed to acquire the cylix with the signature of Cachrylion and the two others with the signature of Hermaios, found a little while ago at Poli-tis-Chrysokou in Cyprus and lately sold by auction at the Hôtel Drouot. These were all three bought for Mr. van Brantighem. Professor Sayce has now published in the Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology (ix. pp. 202 ff.) a copy which he made a year ago at Assuan of the Ptolemaic inscription noticed in this Review (p. 119) among other acquisitions to the Museum. A comparison of his copy with the original would have saved him several conspicuous errors in his rendering.—C. T.

MISCELLANEA FROM EGYPT.—The following notes are of no special importance in themselves, but they may perhaps fit in and illustrate some other remains, if laid before students. A tablet was found this year by Arabs at Naukratis, bearing on it a two-valve door slightly recessed in a doorway, which is surmounted by an Egyptian cornice, the whole about fifteen inches high: the door was painted red. Above it, on the lintel, is cut

ΑΠΟΛΛΩΤΟΣ | ΕΙΜΙΤΟΘΛΑΙΝΟ

in two lines; while on the cornice is faintly scratched the same inscription, apparently a first memorandum to the stone-cutter. The upper inscription, however, though not legible throughout, shows by its spacing the reading Apollodotos in place of the strange Apollotos, which seems to be due to a confusion of the cutter. The interest of it is in showing how a Greek adopted the Egyptian type of a doorway for a funereal stela, while making it in Greek, and not Egyptian, fashion. It appears to be of the middle of the sixth century B.C. I purchased it, and afterwards exchanged it at the Bulak Museum, as M. Grébaut was interested in it.

Another curious block, which I saw in the hands of an Arab dealer, is about fourteen inches square, with two serpents in very high relief on it. They

are reared up, facing, one with the usual crown of Osiris, the other with that of Isis; they differ, the one being plain round-bodied, and the other thicker and with the cobra hood spread out. Pairs of uræi often differ somewhat thus, showing a difference of sexes, even when not bearing Serapis and Isis heads as they do on bracelets in general. The Greek interest comes in with a central device between them; this is in sunk relief, not raised like the serpents on the face of the stone, and shows the seated griffon with one paw placed upon—not a wheel, like the type of Alexandria—but an eight-leaved rosette. This is a trifling difference such as an Egyptian sculptor would be liable to make. It seems probable that this block was built into a wall, perhaps over the door of a house, with the serpents as guardian genii of the house, and the griffon added as a sort of personal device of the owner.

Of Graffiti I have noted the following, which may be unpublished:—

Over a tomb at Tehneh:

ΗΛΕΝΑΑΛΕΙ
ΝΔΡΟCΘΜΟΥΤΟC

At Esneh, on a pillar:

ΧΙCΙ
CΘΡΥCΤ

At El Kab, on the first temple in the valley:

ΠΛΑΤΩΝ
ΕΡΜΩΝΟC
ΗΚΩΠΑΡΑ
ΤΗΜΕΓΙCΤΗΝ
ΘΕΑΝCΜΙΘΙΝ

Also

ΝΙΚΗΡΑΤΟC

and

ΟΨΙΚΤΟΡ
ΑΠΙC

Near Silsileh:

ΦΙΛΗΜΩΝ, ΠΕΤΡΟC, ΠΑΥCΙ,
ΜΑΧΟC

ΔΩΡΙΩΝ, ΜΑΛΧΙΩΝ, ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΑΜ

In a tomb at Silsileh :

CTAVPOCΔΩΝ
XPICTIANΩΝ

In another :

ΠΙΣΤΟΚΛΗΣ ΕΥΜΕΝΟΥΣ ΗΚ//ΙΕΝ
ΤΩΙΚΒΛΠΑΧΩΝΙΟ

At Assuan, on a block of granite by the Philae road, magnificently cut in letters four inches high, sharp, deep, and perfectly straight and regular, is

ΠΥΘΟΓΕΙΤΩΝ
ΝΕΙΛΩΝΟΣ
ΞΑΜΙΟΣ

I visited what appear to be the ruins of Kanobos, about a mile S.W. of Abukir ; it is a large site, with Egyptian statues and Roman mosaic pavements. The attribution of it seems highly probable, as I am told by Mr. Grant (who is reclaiming Lake Abukir) that no other site approaching to such a size is to be seen for a very long way east of this. Unhappily a fort has been made in what appears to have been the temenos of the great temple.—W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE.

[Travellers interested in Graffiti may be warned that the Greek metrical inscription of fourteen lines very prominently cut on the side of a gateway at the Ramesseum at Thebes dates from the present century and celebrates two travellers named Wild and Prichard.—The third of the Graffiti given above is published in Böckh C. I. G. 4835 ; but less accurately.—The second line of the eighth reads, In the 22nd year on the 19th of the (Egyptian) month Pachon.—C. T.]

THASIOTE TOMBS.—The island of Thasos, owing to its wealth in minerals and marbles, retained its importance longer than most of the islands and towns of the East, down in fact to the fall of the Byzantine Empire. During the days of imperial Rome, Thasos actually maintained its independence, electing its own senate, and issuing its own laws, and was not included in the province of Thrace until the fashion for Thasiote marble in Rome had passed away. The marble quarries of Thasos to the south of the island are very extensive, and bear signs of having been more worked than even those of Paros. A whole promontory down by the sea has been cut away foot by foot leaving a large flat surface on the sea level over which the waves dash in winter, and where in summer the inhabitants collect salt, calling it from this fact Alki. We have many instances of the popularity of Thasiote marble in Rome. Seneca tells us "fish preserves were made of Thasiote marble." The Euripides in the Vatican is of the same ; and Belloni asserts that the exterior of the pyramid of Caius Cestius was coated with Thasiote marble.

One of the natural results of possessing an unlimited supply of marble was that the Thasiotes lavished it to an immense extent on the mausolea and sarcophagi

for the reception of their dead : the vast cemetery of the ancient capital of the island must have been perfectly magnificent to behold in the days of its splendour, as an account of slight investigations we made amongst the ruins will testify. On quitting the western wall of the old city, which is still easily traceable, you enter a large plain, bounded on three sides by mountains, on the other by the sea. It roughly forms a parallelogram, two miles in length along the coast, and a mile and a half from the coast to the mountains. The whole of this plain is now covered with olives and brambles, but in ancient times it was covered with massive marble tombs, all erected in straight lines radiating from one point, namely, a gate in the city wall, which is still adorned on the northern side with a fine *stèle* standing against the wall 15 feet in height, and decorated in the centre with a handsome bas-relief representing a man seated on a chair and a woman playing some instrument which is unfortunately damaged but looks as if it had been a barbiton. This was in all probability the gate of the tombs through which the dead were carried.

Of these straight lines of tombs I was able to distinguish ten quite distinctly. The finest tombs appear to have been erected on the two outer lines, namely the one immediately at the edge of the sea, and the one running along the first spurs of the mountain. Numbers of fine sepulchral monuments, large sarcophagi with long metrical and other inscriptions, have from time to time been brought to light amongst the olive trees, notably, the so-called tomb of Antiphon, built on a small projecting rock, on which a figure was found wearing a tunic of gold, which was unfortunately stolen by a Bulgarian workman in excavating the tomb ; and the colossal eagle, which is now in the museum at Bulak, was found amongst a nest of these tombs at the edge of a stream which runs through this plain.

At the end of the line nearest the sea, just at the edge of the mountains and nearly two miles from the town, we were attracted by the debris of what proved on excavation to have been a handsome mausoleum surrounded by a group of sarcophagi ; but owing to its having been converted into a church in later times and thickly overgrown with brambles it required much work before we could restore the original plan. On commencing our work at the eastern side, where the ground began to rise towards the mound, we soon came across two huge marble sarcophagi, the lids of which had been broken in centuries ago to extract the precious metal which the Thasiotes invariably in some form or another put into their tombs. Vases are exceedingly rare in Thasos, gold objects being more frequently found ; and this is accounted for by their possession on the opposite mainland of the gold mines in mount Pangæus. One of the sarcophagi had no inscription ; but the other, which was 7 feet long by 3 feet 4 inches deep, and which was covered by a lid adorned at each corner with a boss, 1 foot 5 inches high, and a roof sloping up to the same elevation as the bosses, carried the following inscriptions :—

ΦΙΛΟΥΜΑΙΝΗ ΚΩΜΕΙΔΟΣ ΠΡΟΣΦΙΛΗΣ ΧΑΙΡΕ
ΤΡΥΓΗΤΙΟΝ ΚΩΜΙΔΟΣ ΠΡΟΣΦΙΛΗΣ ΧΑΙΡΕ

These inscriptions are interesting from the fact that *φιλουμαίνη* is spelt, instead of *φιλουμένη*, which goes far to prove that *ai* in those days as now was pronounced as *e*, and the use of the diphthong suggests that then, as now, the long syllable followed the accent, and again we have *ai* and *i* similarly confounded, which would make it appear that they were pronounced

then as now similarly. On many Thasiote tombs *χαίρει* is spelt *χέρει*, proving incontestably that in those days the pronunciation was the same as it is in modern Greek.

On pursuing our work we found the fragments of another pretty little sarcophagus, adorned at one corner with a female figure with wings, holding in

her hand a crown ; above it and at each of the four corners were rams' heads, and a garland ran all round, supported in the front by the figure of a naked

child. Close to this we found fragments of another small sarcophagus, also adorned with rams' heads and a garland, and carrying the inscription :—

ΕΡΜΗΣ ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΥ ΠΡΟΣΦΙΛΗΣ ΧΑΙΡΕ.

The large mausoleum itself, around which these tombs were grouped, stood on a platform approached by five grades of marble steps, the platform being 27 feet long by 11½ feet wide at the edge of the highest grade.

In the lowest grade of steps we found an incision had been made and a large sarcophagus inserted underneath the building ; this was approached by a narrow passage between two walls, 18 feet long ; without destroying the whole superstructure we could not uncover this sarcophagus so as to see if it had an inscription on it, and as we saw that it had been opened at the side to extract whatever of value it had contained, we deemed it best to leave it as it was. Evidently this was the tomb of the individual to whose honour the mausoleum had been erected, for it was the only sarcophagus we could find actually under the building.

On the top of the platform there had once stood a very handsome and massive building, the lower chamber of which was formed of huge blocks of marble, with a corniced edge on the side facing the sea, namely that 27 feet long. Apparently there had only been two blocks of marble on this side, one of which bore the inscription—

ΦΙΛΟΦ

ΦΙΛΟ

in letters of a good period, suggesting that the name of the man to whose honour the mausoleum had been erected was one Philophron, son of Philophron. On the other large block we found a long metrical inscription evidently added at a later date.

Concerning the building which surmounted this lower chamber we can of course only offer speculations from the nature of the fragments of marble columns and decorations found amongst the ruins. Apparently huge stones with corniced edges formed the roof of this lower chamber, on the top of which stood an open Doric building supported by columns, of which we found many drums ; these columns had been very fine, 2 feet 7 inches in diameter at the base, and with 22 flutings ; the drums had been fastened together by neatly made iron rivets soldered into the marble with lead.

We also found the body of a well-formed marble lion, with traces of a mane down the back, and with a girth of 4 feet 1 inch. This fragment of the lion was found on the side towards the sea, and doubtless there had been another or others at the corners of the building.

A close examination of this one mausoleum enabled us to form some faint idea of the magnificent effect which this plain of tombs by the sea-shore must have afforded in the days of Thasiote splendour. Amongst the thickly-growing brambles are many indications of mausolea of equal magnificence, the excavation of which we did not undertake. The whole plain in which is the olive plantation is covered with 12 feet of soil above the original level on which the tombs stood, making it of course a matter of impossibility to recover the form and dimensions of many of them.

Tombs of the poorer class seem altogether to have been excluded from this plain, and we found many of these in lines running up a narrow valley at the back of the town. Most of them consisted of small terra-

cotta sarcophagi about 3 feet square, some decorated with a pretty pattern, others perfectly plain, and each having in it nothing but a small vase of rude workmanship. The presence of golden ornaments in a few of the tombs which have lately been found is sufficient to account for the general rilling of them before the fall of earth had covered them, and before certain erections of later Roman and Byzantine date had been constructed above them.

The marble quarries of Thasos, as I have said, were situated to the south of the island, and on a narrow tongue of land joining the marble promontory to the island was situated a town which seems to have been the second in importance in the island, and probably wholly devoted to the commerce in marble. Here we found buried in the sand by the shore other tombs, and fragments of beautifully-worked sarcophagi ; one lid had bosses 1 foot 10 inches wide by 1 foot 3 inches high, decorated with female heads ; another had the bosses decorated with wreaths of flowers, and the sloping roofs of the lids were occasionally decorated with well-worked diaper patterns. In the centre of the village stands a very large sarcophagus with a metrical inscription, which M. Perrot published in his monograph on Thasos, and on a tomb we dug up in the sand we found an inscription to the memory of a lady, which tomb was 6 feet 1 inch long by 2 feet 8 inches wide, and edged with a neat border.

On the top of the hill overlooking the sea we found amongst broken sarcophagi the fragments of several inscriptions—some plain, some metrical. A thorough excavation of this spot would undoubtedly bring to light interesting and varied devices in marble sarcophagi ; the ground is full of them, but owing to the accumulation of soil they are at a great depth.—J. THEODORE BENT.

[Thasos is held by the family of the Khedive : hence the transfer of the Thasiote eagle to Bulak.—C. T.]

Revue Archéologique. March—April, 1887. Paris.

1. M. Bazin on remains of the Roman theatre at Antibes, mostly demolished in 1691 to supply materials for Vauban's fortifications : plan. 5. M. Muntz on the remains of ancient Rome at the Renaissance : concluded. 6. M. Deloche on signet rings of the Merovingian period : continued. 7. M. Monceaux argues that the poet Avienus was really proconsul of Africa, although the old date for his proconsulate must be abandoned. 8. Dr. Néroutsos-Bey on Greek inscriptions from Alexandria, some of them previously published : to be continued. 9. M. Guillemand on Gaulish inscriptions, starting with the bilingual of Todi : to be continued. M. Théodore Reinach receives Mr. Head's *Historia Numorum* with faint praise.—C. T.

Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique. April, 1887. Athens and Paris.

1. MM. Cousin and Deschamps on a decree of the Roman Senate dated 15 August 39 B.C. found by them within the temple of Zeus Panamaros near Stratoniceia in Caria. 3. M. Fougères summarises the results of his excavations at Delos last summer, and publishes thirty-eight of the inscriptions that he found there : in these are signatures of the sculptors Agasias of Ephesos, son of Menophilos ; perhaps Antisthenes ; Boethos and Theodosios ; Eutychides (of

Miletos); and Hephaestion of Athens, son of Myron. 4. M. Holleaux publishes a marble head found by him near the temple of Apollo Ptoos and belonging to the statue of an 'Apollo' with the dedication by Pythias and Aschriion previously found there and

published by him in the *Bulletin* last year: two plates. 5. M. Foucart suggests that the record of victories discovered at Olympia and hitherto assigned to Theagenes of Thasos should rather be assigned to Diagoras of Rhodes.—C. T.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Athenaeum: 21 May; an obituary notice of Mr. Keith-Falconer. 4 June; a review of F. H. Chase's Chrysostom, a study in the history of Biblical interpretation. 4 June; review of Lupton's life of Colet.

Academy: 21 May; a letter from the Bishop of Durham to show that the list of Bishops of Rome contained in Hegesippus' lost memoirs (Euseb. *H. E.* 4.22) is preserved in Epiphanius Haer. 27, 6; a letter from Rob. Ellis from Rome communicating his discovery of a new codex of the *Culex* of which the next number of the *Journal of Philology* is to give an account. Its date is the end of the 14th century; 'a passage in that poem till now given up as incurably vitiated is convincingly restored by the new codex': a letter from R. Brown, jun., on the Etruscan Numerals. 28 May; a review of Welldon's Rhetoric by J. E. Sandys. 4 June; a letter from T. W. Allen on compendiums in Greek Palaeography (*ἀπαράταξις*); S. G. Owen emends Ovid *Tristia* 5. 5. 45 nata pudicitia est moris probitasque fidesque, read oris for moris, cp. Martial 11.103 tanta tibi est animi probitas orisque. 11 June; letters from F. J. A. Hort and I. O. Westwood on the Cod. Amiatinus, letter from M. A. Stein on the derivation of meridies, letter from W. M. Lindsay on compendiums in Greek palaeography; reviews of A. Darmesteter's *La Vie des Mots*, by H. Bradley, and of Head's *Historia Numorum* by C. Oman; an account of the performance of the *Audularia* at Melbourne University with a new conclusion by Prof. Tucker. 18 June; reviews of J. Réville, *La religion à Rome sous les Sévères* by F. T. Richards, of R. Ellis' Fables of Avianus by A. S. Wilkins; Isaac Tayler, in answer to A. Lang, attempts to explain the story of Cupid and Psyche as a nature-myth; an account of a paper by J. H. Moulton at Camb. Phil. Society.

The *Journal of Education* contains an interesting paper by A. Sidgwick on the 'Future of Classical Education.' He describes the expansion of classical studies, which has taken place of late years, as being 'in fact a renaissance'; gives a warning against over-specialisation on the part of teachers, and the substitution of erudition for training on the part of learners; speaks of the danger of the *production* of knowledge outrunning the *distribution* of it, and of the need of an intermediate class between the researchers and the general body of teachers. He thinks that in future the early training will be more systematic than in the past, but that in the higher stages there will be more general enlightenment, less mere grammar, perhaps no verse composition; 'it will be common perhaps for a boy to drop prose composition'; but the school will be a place of more varied life and interest, the masters will take up different lines of special study. While the Latin and Greek languages will be as well known as now to the few, the many will have a far greater knowledge of the matter than at present, and along with this a good working knowledge of the language, such as will enable them to have a familiar acquaintance with the history, the people, and the life of the ancients.

Expositor, June. Mr. Gore, criticising Prof. Sanday's papers from the Anglican point of view,

expresses general agreement in regard to the origin of the Christian ministry, but desiderates 'a fuller recognition of the principle of succession.' Mr. W. H. Simcox rejects Volter's analysis of the Apocalypse into an original work of the Apostle John, written about 65, an appendix by the same about 69, and three later recensions. Similarly Vischer's hypothesis favoured by Prof. Harnack, that the book is a Jewish apocalypse with Christian interpolations, is rejected on the ground that the Christian idea of the Messiah pervades the whole, and that, if the groundwork is pre-Christian, it is incredible that the name of St. John should have been substituted for that of the original writer. Mr. Simcox is himself inclined to believe that we have, besides the original apocalypse of St. John, four distinct visions contained in vii. 9-17, xi. 1-13, xiv. 14-20, xvii., 'visions, however, of the same seer or of the same prophetic school.' Prof. Westcott continues his series on the Revised Version, this time pointing out its value in restoring uniformities of language. The number closes with a slight paper by Dr. Schaff on the German and Anglo-American revisions of the Bible.

Hermes, vol. xxii. part 2, contains: 1. Über die dem Joannes Antiochenus zugeschriebenen Excerpta Salmasiana, by W. Ph. Boissvain, who argues that the Excerpta of the Codex Regius 1763, placed by C. Müller among the other fragments of Johan. Antioch. are not genuine with the exception perhaps of fragments 1-29. The arguments are partly negative—such as (1) the contradiction between some of the Salm. Exce. and the genuine fr.; (2) the agreement of the Salm. Exce. with Dion rather than Herodian in the period from Commodus to Gordian; (3) the absence of all trace in the Salm. Exce. of the Greek translation of Eutropius used by Johan. Antioch.—partly positive (1) the presence in some of the Salm. Exce., referring to the kingly period, of Byzantine pedantry alien to the genuine fragments, and (2) in the imperial history the coincidence of the Salm. Exce. with the anecdotes of Cedrenus, Glycas, Constantinus Manasses, &c., which points to one common source. 2. Die Textesüberlieferung der angeblich Hippokratishen Schrift über die alte Heilkunde, by H. Kühlewein, who maintains that the Codex Parisinus A is the best authority for the text of *περί ἀρχαίων ἱατρικῆς*. Where this needs correcting, it must be by means of the Marcianus 269, which in most cases supports the good readings of the former, and in some places corrects it. To support this view of the value and functions of the two Codices, many examples are given. 3. Die erste Rede des Antiphon, by U. v. Wilamowitz-Möllendorf. An interesting analysis 'der ältesten attischen Gerichtsrede,' in which the essential legal points are clearly brought out and explained. 4. Demotika der Metoiken II. by the same: continued from previous number. From the fact that the demes of the *μέτοικοι* are given, the writer seeks to prove that they must have stood in some legal relation to the demes, and so to the tribes; that in fact they were not in the position of mere clients needing a *προστάτης*, according to the common view, but quasi-citizens. To prove this position he claims to show that the *μέτοικοι*

share both the rights and duties and religious ceremonies of the *δημόται*. Thus they served as *δπλῖται*; contributed to the *εἰσφορά*, were subject to the *χορηγία*; took part in the *Παναθήναια*, &c. *A priori* too, the Athenians must have found it almost necessary to incorporate the thousands of *μέτοικοι* with the citizen body. The adverse testimony of the grammarians, of Isokrates, and of Hypereides is then explained away. The truth may be that the *προστάτης* was a member of the deme, who introduced the *μέτοικος* into it, and was his *ἐγγυητής*: and so the *προστασία* ended with the simple act, but was falsely thought to be permanent. But if the *μέτοικος* only became one by entry into a deme, he could not hold the same position as a *ξένος*, in spite of the definition of Aristoph. of Byzant. The position of the *ξένος* rested on *συμβολαί*, which were liable to be cancelled by war: that of the *μέτοικος* on Athenian law, and was unalterable. The article is able and interesting, but will hardly be judged to have settled the question.

5. Ueber das Capitel de versuum generibus bei Diomedes, by G. Schultz. An attempt to discover the sources of this chapter of Diomedes and to explain the arbitrary arrangement of the metres in it. Schultz believes that a number of various treatises were made use of, and unscientifically mixed up. The article is ingenious, and for specialists instructive.

6. Florentinische Homerscholien, by H. Schrader. A discussion on the value of the Scholia to Homer in the Codex Laurentianus, plut. xxxii 3. In opposition to E. Mars in vol. xix. pp. 287 ff. Schrader thinks that the Laurent and Venetus B are nearly of the same date, and copied from a common source. The only special value therefore of the former is to provide Scholia of the 'prima manus' for ff. 68, 69, and 145 of Venetus B, which are supplied by a later hand. A similar opinion is given of the value of the Scholia to the Odyssey in Codex Laurentianus, plut. lvii. 32.

7. Stadtrechtbriefe von Orkistos und Tymandos, by Th. Mommsen. An interesting account of Prof. Ramsay's finding and decipherment of the inscription given imperfectly in C.I.L. iii. p. 63. The emperor's letter to Ablabius is here given in full, and part of the petition of the Orkisteni. Part of a similar document is added, communicated by W. J. R. S. Sterrett, referring to Tymandos in Pisidia. 8. Zu Athenaeus, by G. Kaibel. Are the excerpts from the two first books of Athenaeus in the Lexicon of Suidas taken from the epitome of the books or from the larger edition now lost? Suidas certainly used the larger edition for the books now extant in the Venetian Codex. There is therefore a presumption that he used it for the first two. This presumption is confirmed by a number of instances in which Suidas contains points which are omitted in the epitome, and which he must therefore have got from the original.—Miscellen: Scenisches by C. Robert, who suggests that the two actors in the votive relief found in the Peiraens are holding mirrors, not tympana, and that the figure sitting at the foot of the *κλίνη* of Dionysus is neither his wife, nor Artemis Munichia, but the nymph of the victorious *φυλή*, who in the *μεγάλα Διονύσια* is wedded to the god of the festival. This is represented on the great crater in the museum at Naples.

Rheinisches Museum, vol. xlii. pt. 2 contains: Die pseudo-heraklitischen Briefe, u. ihr Verfasser (E. Pfeleiderer.) 'Letters 4 to 7 certainly, 8 and 9 almost certainly, and *all* most probably, were the work of an educated Jew of Alexandria, perhaps the writer of the Book of Wisdom.' Zur Entwicklung der kaiserlichen Stadtpräfector (E. Klebs.) 'That Augustus originated the appointment of *praefectus*

urbi, to act as police magistrate and civil head of the *cohortes urbanae*; hence the correction of xx. into xv. in Tac. *Ann.* is unnecessary.' Zu den historischen Arbeiten der ältesten Peripatetiker (F. Dümmler.) i. Politeien, Politik u. *πολιτικά τὰ πρὸς τοὺς καιροὺς*. ii. *Νόμοι* und *νομικά βαρβαρικά*. iii. Sakralalterthümer. Investigating how far Plutarch, Nicolaus, &c. are indebted to Theophrastus on the above subjects. Philodem über das homerische Fürstenideal (F. Bücheler.) On the Homeric quotations in the fragmentary work of Philodemus, *περὶ τοῦ καθ' Ὁμηρον ἀγαθοῦ βασιλέως*. Die Gründung von Naukratis (G. Hirschfeld.) 'Naukratis was given to the Greeks by Amasis, and the earliest date for its antiquities is 570 B.C.' The Abu Simbel inscriptions date from Psammetichus I.' Zur Entzifferung der messapischen Inschriften, iv. (W. Deecke.) Treating of the six most important of those published in *Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità*, 1884. Nachahmer u. Vorbilder des Dichters Gregorios von Nazianz (A. Ludwig.) 'His poems influenced Nonnus and show acquaintance with Aratus, Theocritus, &c.' Polykrates Anklage, u. Lysias' Vertheidigung des Sokrates (R. Hirzel.) 'That the oration against Socrates current in antiquity bore the name of Polycrates, and called forth in reply Lysias' *Defence*, Xenophon's *Memorabilia*, and the episode in Plato's *Meno*.' Ueber die Nausikaaepisode (F. Marx.) 'Read *ἐσθῆτα φαεινὴν* in vi. 209. Expunge ll. 129, 136, 221, 222, read *μετῆλθεν* in 135, and then the *πτόρθος* is simply a *ἰκετήριος κλάδος*.' Alexandrinische Studien (A. Gereke.) (1) The date of Magas of Cyrene. 'Reigned from 300—297 to 251—247 B.C.' (2) The accession to power of Hiero II. 'Hiero was named *general* in 270 and *βασιλεὺς* in 265: the Mamertine expedition therefore bears the latter date' (3) Places Ptolemy II.'s marriage with his sister Arsinoe between 276 and 270. Quelle der Ueberlieferung ueber Ammonius Sakkas (H. von Arnim.) 'The third chapter of Nemesius, *de Anima* (and prob. the second also, if Numenius is corrupt) is based upon Porphyry, *Συμμικτὰ Ζητήματα*, as is Priscian *Solutions* I. p. 558 foll., and both represent teaching of Ammonius. Ueber Eratosthenes Katasterismen (J. Böhme.) Demonstrating against Maass the Eratosthenic origin of the Catasterismi.

Under the head of *Miscellen*: Zu Petronius cap. 58 (L. Friedländer.) 'The three riddles are all from spinning and weaving: the first denotes the process of weaving; the second is the spindle; the third, distaff and spindle.' Zu Quintilian (E. Wölfflin.) x. i. 60 *idem amarior* for *quoquam minor*. x. i. 63 *elegans et* for *dicendi vi*. x. i. 65 after *praecepius* Haln's *est* and Wiegand's *et admirandus* should alike be removed. x. i. 69 *Hunc imitatus* for *Admiratus*. Ad Apulei *Metamorphoses* scripsit J. Van der Vliet. ix. 8, p. 159, 18 f. Read *forte* and *bobus iungendo*. ix. 10, p. 160, 25 read *ut noxios* cf. Tac. *Ann.* v. 11. ix. 19, p. 166, 18 omit *festinat* and read *et ut magnis...percito nuntiat*. x. 7, p. 186, 12 insert *potui* after *scire*. x. 19, p. 194, 10 *at ille nequaquam curans quam posset illi de me* etc. x. 25, p. 197, 26 insert *multis* before *spectatus*. x. 26 read *clisum* for *clisus*. xi. 3, p. 206, 27 insert *vestis* or *tunica* before *porrectis*. xi. 20 read *cognitis...fabulis* for *[in]cognitis...famulis*. Eine griechische Inschrift des Cyriacus (K. Schumacher.) From the Delian inscr. in *Bull. de Corr. Hell.* I. p. 388, no. 37, restoring that in *Bull.* vi. p. 491, no. 4. Älteste lateinische Inschrift (F. B.) Found by Helbig and Dümmler on a golden fibula in a Praenestine tomb. It dates from the 6th century B.C. and is interesting chiefly for FHE:FAAKED (retrograde) showing reduplicated perf and the aspirate character of the f. sound.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

BOOKS PUBLISHED IN ENGLAND.

- Hallward* (N. L.) *Genders of Greek Nouns*. 4 page card. 8vo. London. D. Nutt. 3d.
- Harris* (J. R.) *The origin of the Leicester Codex of the New Testament*. 4to. 66 pp. Map and two facsimile plates. Cambridge. Pitt Press. 10s. 6d.
- Herodotus*. *The Ionian revolt, extracted from Herodotus with Introduction and Notes by the Rev. E. D. Stone, M.A.* 12mo. xi. 51 pp. Eton. Drake. 2s.
- Lucian*. *Trips to the Moon. From the Greek, by Th. Francklin*. 18mo. 192 pp. London. Cassell. 3d.
- Ovid*. *Easy selections from Ovid in elegiac verse, arranged and edited with Notes, Vocabularies and Exercises in Latin Verse Translation by H. Wilkinson*. 16mo. 102 pp. London. Macmillan. 1s. 6d.
- Paley* (F. A.) *The truth about Homer. With some remarks on Prof. Jebb's Introduction to Homer*. 8vo. 24 pp. London. F. Norgate. 1s.
- Plato*. *Meno. With Introduction and Notes by St. George Stock*. 12mo. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 2s. 6d.
- Torr* (Cecil). *Rhodes in Modern Times*. 8vo. 160 pp. Three Plates. Cambridge. Pitt Press. 8s.

BOOKS PUBLISHED ON THE CONTINENT.

- Ascoli* (G. J.) *Sprachwissenschaftliche Briefe. Autorisirte Uebersetzung von B. Güterbock*. 8vo. xvi. 228 pp. Leipzig. Hirzel. 4 Mk.
- Avicni* (Rufi Festi), *carmina, rec. A. Holder*. 8vo. (xv. 296 pp.) Innsbruck. Wagner. 10 Mk.
- Baand* (O.) *Das attische Demeter-Kore-Fest der Epikleidia. Neuer Beitrag zur griechischen Heortologie. Teil 1*. 4to. 31 pp. Berlin. Gaertner. 1 Mk.
- Belger* (Chr.) *Beitraege zur Kenntniss der griechischen Kuppelgräber. With four Woodcuts*. 4to. 40 pp. Berlin. Gaertner. 1 Mk.
- Berger* (P.) *Note sur 300 nouveaux ex-voto de Carthage*. 8vo. 7 pp. (*extr. Comptes-rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions*).
- Besobrasoff* (Marie) *Ueber Plotin's Glückseligkeitslehre*. 8vo. 39 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk.
- Bethe* (E.) *Quaestiones Diodorae mythographae. Dissertatio inauguralis philologica*. 8vo. (106 pp.) Göttingen. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 2 Mk. 40 Pf.
- Blümner* (H.) *Technologie und Terminologie der Gewerbe und Künste bei Griechen und Römern. Band IV. Abtheilung 2. Mit zahlreichen Abbildungen*. 8vo. xiii. 379—627 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 7 Mk. 20 Pf.
- Cornellii Nepotii vitae selectae. Praemissae sunt breviores narrationes. Scholarum in usum ed. Adb. Meingast*. 8vo. 47 pp. Wien. Manz. 40 Pf.
- Dureau* (V.) *Histoire des Grecs depuis les temps les plus reculés jusqu'à la réduction de la Grèce en province romaine. Nouvelle édition augmentée et enrichie de plus de 1,500 gravures et de 50 cartes. Vol. I. Royal 8vo. 827 pp. 808 cuts and 9 maps. Paris. Hachette. 25 francs.*
- Eutropius*. *Para uso das escolas por A. E. da Silva Dias*. 8vo. 155 pp. Porto. 400 reales.
- Faerber* (R.) *De Apulei quae fertur physiognomoniam recensenda et emendanda*. 8vo. 34 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 1 Mk. 20 Pf.
- Frey* (K.) *Das Leben des Perikles*. 4to. 35 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk. 20 Pf.
- Gasda* (A.) *Kritische Bemerkungen zu Themistios. Fortsetzung*. 4to. 20 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 90 Pf.
- Gruber* (G.) *Einige Reste nebengeordneter Satzbildung in untergeordnetem Satzgefüge bei Thucydides und Xenophon, namentlich nach temporalen Vordersätzen*. 4to. 20 pp. Breklum. Christliche Buchhandlung. 1 Mk.
- Hartmann* (L. M.) *De exilio apud Romanos inde ab initio Bellorum Civilium usque ad Severi Alexandri principatum*. 8vo. 63 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. 1 Mk. 20 Pf.
- Homolle* (Th.) *Rapport sur une mission archéologique dans l'île de Délos*. 8vo. 51 pp. plate. Paris. (*extr. Archives des missions scientifiques*).
- Leagnick* (B.) *Der Bildungswerk der Lateinischen nach dem auf unseren Gymnasien herrschenden Betriebe*. 4to. 27 pp. Berlin. Gaertner. 1 Mk.
- Lysias*. *Discours contre Erastosthène, avec sommaires, analyses et notes par A. Mottet*. 12mo. 32 pp. Paris. Belin. 75c.
- Magnus* (H.) *Studien zu Ovids Metamorphosen*. 4to. 31 pp. Berlin. Gaertner. 1 Mk.
- Matthias* (Th.) *Zu alten Grammatikern*. 8vo. 47 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 1 Mk. 60 Pf.
- Mayerhofer* (A.) *Geschichtlich-topographische Studien über das alte Rom. With 1 map*. 8vo. iii. 115 pp. München. Lindauer. 2 Mk.
- Phaedrus*. *Para uso dos escolas*. 8vo. xii. 141 pp. Lisbon. 450 reales.
- Sallust*. *C. Sallusti Crispi Catilina Jugurtha ex historiis orationes et epistulae. In usum scholarum edidit A. Eussner*. 12mo. xxii. 146 pf. Leipzig. Teubner. 45 Pf.
- Schneus* (M.) *Lateinische Syntax für Quarta und Tertia. Im engsten Anschlusse an die Übungsbücher von Dr. Meiring hrsg.* 8vo. vi. 165 pp. Düsseldorf. Schwann. 2 Mk.
- Schmidt* (F. W.) *Kritische Studien zu den griechischen Dramatikern nebst einem Anhang zur Kritik der Anthologie. Band III. Zu den klein. Frag., den Adespota, den Kom. u. der Anthologie*. 8vo. 236 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. 7 Mk.
- Schmidt* (M. C. P.) *Zur Geschichte der geographischen Litteratur bei Griechen und Römern*. 4to. 27 pp. Berlin. Gaertner. 1 Mk.
- Schmidt* (O. E.) *Die handschriftliche Ueberlieferung der Briefe Ciceros an Atticus, Q. Cicero, M. Brutus in Italien*. Royal 8vo. 108 pp. with four plates. Leipzig. Hirzel. 6 Mk.
- Theophrasti Simplicii historiae edidit Carolus de Boer*. 12mo. xiv. 437 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 6 Mk.
- Wibber* (L.) *Quaestionum Laconicarum capita II. Dissertatio inauguralis philologica*. 8vo. (64 pp.) Göttingen. Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht. 1 Mk. 60.
- Wohlbrab* (M.) *Die Platonhandschriften und ihre gegenseitigen Beziehungen*. 8vo. 85 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 2 Mk. 40 Pf.
- Zingerle* (A.) *Kleine philologische Abhandlungen. Heft 4. Mit einem Sachregister zur ganzen Sammlung*. 8vo. (viii. 104 pp.) Innsbruck. Wagner. 3 Mk. 20 Pf.

UNIVERSITY INTELLIGENCE.

(Continued from page 209.)

OXFORD.

UNIVERSITY PRIZES: *Stanhope Essay*, T. See-combe, Balliol (Felsted); *Acc.*, V. A. L. Fisher, New (Winchester), G. A. Wood, Balliol (Owens Coll.).

COLLEGES: *Christ Church Student*, W. Hobhouse, Fellow of Hertford (Eton); *House Sch.* (Math.), P. H. Jones (Christ's Hospital); *Erh.*, F. F. Liddell (Ch. Ch. Eton); *Trinity Fellow*, H. E. D. Blakiston, late scholar (Tonbridge).

NAT. SCIENCE: *Class 1.*—A. E. Buckhurst (Chemistry), Univ. (Rochester), E. B. Cook (Chemistry), Ch. Ch. (Manchester), J. B. Former (Botany), Magd. (Atherston), J. R. Findlay (Chemistry), Ball. (Harrow), J. L. Hoskyns Abrahall (Chemistry), Magd. (Eton), O. H. Latter (Morphology), Keble, W. Overend (Physiology), Keble (Yorkshire Coll. Leeds), G. L. C. Pritchard (Physiology), Hertf. (Clifton), F. Pullinger (Chemistry), C. C. C. (Manchester), R. V. Williams (Morphology), Ch. Ch. (Westminster). *Class 2.*—E. H. Cartwright (Physiology), Ex., A. E. Field (Physics), Trin., F. A. Heron (Morphology), New, E. H. House (Chemistry), Trin., E. Mears (Chemistry), Queen's, W. A. Roberts (Chemistry), Non-Coll., B. B. Skirrow (Physics), Univ., J. F. Tristram (Chemistry), Mert., J. K. Wynne Edwards (Physics), Ch. Ch.

INDIAN LANGUAGES: *Class 2.*—L. G. Bhadbhade, Ball., N. S. Brodie, Ch. Ch., W. H. Lee, Joh., H. J. O'Beirne, Ball., E. Rogers, New.

CIVIL LAW: *Class 1.*—R. A. Shepherd, Trin. (Sedburgh). *Class 2.*—C. M. Laing, Magd., J. Oldfield, non-Coll., H. J. Turrell, Ex.

FORTHCOMING EXAMINATIONS.

ALL SOULS: (begins Oct. 26) one Fellowship in Law.

MAGDALEN: (begins Oct. 11) one Nat. Science Demyslip (£80), candidates must be under 19 on 17 Oct.

BALLIOL: (begins Nov. 15) one law and history (Brackenbury) scholarship (£80): (begins Nov. 17) three classical scholarships (£80), candidates must be under 19 on Nov. 29; three classical exhibitions (£70); two mathematical scholarships (£80); two math. scholarships at QUEEN'S and CORPUS (£80) will be awarded on the same examination.

A combined examination (beginning Nov. 17) for Nat. Science scholarships and exhibitions. BALLIOL: one Sch. (£80), one Exh. (£40). EXETER: one Sch. (£80). CHRIST CHURCH: one Sch. (£80), one Exh. (£85). TRINITY: one Schol. (£80). No limits of age. Names sent to Master of Balliol on or before Nov. 10.

HERTFORD (begins Nov. 23), eleven scholarships: three open classical (£100); one open Math. (£100); two open (Lusby) scholarships (60); to the rest there are various restrictions. No limit of age.

BRASENOSE, PEMBROKE, WORCESTER, CHRIST CHURCH combined exam. for Mathematical scholarships (begins Nov. 29): one scholarship at each college (£80); and also two open exhibitions (about £30) at Worcester. Candidates for the scholarships must be under 19 on Dec. 3.

CAMBRIDGE.

UNIVERSITY SCHOLARSHIPS: *Craven Student* (Classics), E. A. Gardner, Caius (City of London); *Walker Student* (Pathology), J. W. Hunter, M.D. Edinburgh, F.R.S.E.; *Kenniatt Sch.* (Hebrew), 1. R. V. Kennett, Queen's (Merchant Taylors'), 2. A. B. G. Lillingston, Queen's (Merchant Taylors'); *Whewell* (Int. Law), 1. A. L. Davies, Trin. (Marlboro'), 2. A. B. Case, Trin.

UNIVERSITY PRIZES: *Mason* (Hebrew), R. V. Kennett, Queen's (Merchant Taylors'); *Forke* (Law), T. E. Serutther, Trin. (Mill Hill and Univ. Coll. London); *Acc.*, E. Jenks, King's (Dulwich); *Minshull* (Pol. Econ.), S. M. Leathes, Trin. (Eton).

COLLEGES: *Clare Fellows*, A. Larmor (Belfast), C. R. Jessop (Univ. Coll. London); *Pembroke Fellows*, A. V. Leahy (Uppingham and Trin. Coll. Dublin), E. G. Browne; *Caius* (Tancred Physic. Student), A. L. Tatham (Lancaster); *Corpus Scholars* (Cl.) G. L. Richardson (Sheffield), 1st year; (Math.) J. L. Boulden (R. Inst.), 2nd year; *Queen's Hon. Fellow*, G. B. Finch; *Fellow*, W. R. Coates (Trin. Coll. Dublin); *Scholars*, (Math.) G. Duthie (Aberdeen), 1st year; (Cl.) W. R. Falkner (Weymouth), 1st year; *S. Catharine's Hon. Fellows*, Rt. Rev. H. Philpott, Bishop of Worcester; Rt. Rev. W. Boyd Carpenter, Bishop of Ripon, Rev. G. F. Browne.

ANNOUNCEMENTS: *Cavendish*. Two Scholarships of £30 per annum for 3 years for candidates under 17 on August 3rd, 1887, on which day the examination begins; subjects, classical and mathematical. Names to be sent in one week before.

CLASSICAL TRIPOS, Part I.—*Class I.: Division 1*, A. F. Ramsay, Girton; *Division 2*, J. H. Badley, Trin. (Rugby), L. G. B. J. Ford, King's (Repton), W. Loring, King's (Eton), G. L. Pilkington, Pemb. (Uppingham), F. W. Thomas, Trin. (Birmingham); *Division 3*, W. G. Headlam, King's (Harrow), F. G. Hughes, King's (Uppingham), H. Macmaster, Cai. (Liverpool College), N. A. North, Chr. (Blackheath), N. H. Rendall, Trin. (Harrow), G. Swift, Emm. (Oakham), J. N. H. Wing, Trin. (Bury S. Edmund's).

Class II.: Division 1, W. C. Bridgeman, Trin. (Eton), R. R. Frederick, Magd. (Yarmouth), E. Lewis, Corp. (Eton), W. C. MacDonald, Pemb. (Aberdeen), E. N. Marshall, Joh. (Sedburgh), S. W. Meek, Trin. (Harrow), C. R. Miller, Pemb. (Chr. Hosp.), B. Pares, Trin. (Harrow), E. H. Pearce, Pet. (Chr. Hosp.), R. N. Pope, Joh. (Merchant Taylors'), W. R. Pridaux, Queen's (City of London), F. S. Ranken, Queen's (Highgate), G. D. Scott, Trin. (Haileybury), F. W. G. Sidebotham, Cai., W. H. Ward, Cla. (Repton), H. F. J. Wright, Pemb. (Highgate), K. Liberty, Girton; *Division 2*, F. C. Boddard, Trin., H. F. E. Blanchamp, Chr., H. S. Cronin, Trin., E. R. Ellis, Trin., R. H. Fuller, Emm., W. R. Greenstock, Joh., C. W. Greenstreet, Chr., P. B. Halcombe, King's, R. O. Hutchinson, Jes., G. W. Kinman, Joh., H. C. Marillier, Pet., C. Marriott, Sid., E. B. Nicholson, Joh., F. H. Oates, Trin., F. G. Padwick, Trin., G. H. Peacock, Cla., H. C. Sharpe, Trin., T. H. Sifton, Joh., P. Simpson, H. Selw., G. Stephenson, Trin., H. C. Stokes, Pemb., C. T. Whitmell, Sid., A. P. Williams-Freeman, Trin., J. J. Withers, King's, C. N. Ashford, Newnham, E. M. Watson, Girton; *Division 3*, W. D. Barnes, Pemb., C. Buttar, Pemb., J. W. Eyre, Magd., D. T. B. Field, Joh., C. Gallacher, Trin., C. Hartley, Magd., V. C. Le Fanu, Trin., H. Manley, Emm., A. Neild, Pemb., F. R. Nethersole, Emm., F. E. New, Pet., W. H. S. Peake, Cla., F. L. Perkins, Pemb.; H. H. Schreiber, Cla., E. H. L. Watson, Cai., A. L. S. Riding, Girton.

CLASSICAL TRIPOS, PART II.—The letters *b*, *c*, *e*, appended to the name of a candidate denote the section or sections for which he is placed in the first class (*b* Philosophy, *c* History, *e* Language). The letter *a* indicates that a candidate has also attained a first class standard in section A (Translation and Composition). The asterisk denotes especial distinction.—*Class 1*: E. W. Brooks (*a*, *c*), King's (Eton), R. S. Conway (*a*, *e**), Caius (City of London), W. Cowper (*c*), Pemb. (Canterbury), P. Giles (*a*, *e**), *e**), Caius (Aberdeen), R. S. Haydon (*e*), Christ's (S.

Paul's, J. W. Headlam (*b. c.*), King's (Eton), C. E. T. Headlam (*a. b.*), Trin. H. Haileybury, E. G. W. Hewlett (*a.*), Trin. Owens College, E. C. Marchant (*a**), Pet. (Christ's Hospital), R. R. Ottley (*b.*), Trin. (Wellington), J. L. A. Paton (*a**, *c**), Joh. (Nottingham and Shrewsbury), C. A. McL. Pond (*c.*), Joh. (City of London), N. Weld (*a. c.*), King's (City of London), C. Williams (*a**, *b.*), Trin. (Eton), L. Poozek (*b.*), Newnham, M. Powell (*a.*), Newnham.

Second Class: C. S. H. Breton, Joh., D. E. Clapton, Magd., F. H. C. Marshall, Sid., R. W. Philpott, Cath., J. R. C. P. Tomlin, Pemb., J. H. Vine, Christ's.

MATHEMATICAL TRIPOS, Part I.—*Wranglers:* 1, H. F. Baker, Joh. (Perse School), A. W. Flux, Joh. (Portsmouth), J. C. Iles, Trin. (Lancing), J. H. Mitchell, Trin. (Melbourne); 5, J. B. Peace, Emman. (Aberdeen); 6, E. W. Brown, Christ's (Totteridge Park); 7, N. J. Berry, Trin. (Pr. Tuit.); 8, J. T. Little, Trin. (Framlingham and King's College, London); 9, W. G. Clay, Trin. (Cheltenham), T. Varley, Joh. (University College, London); 11, L. S. Milward, Pemb. (Malvern), E. Young, Christ's (Trent); 13, W. D. Eggar, Trin. (Brighton); 14, T. L. Atkinson, Christ's (Doncaster), H. E. Soper, Trin. (St. Paul's); 16, H. R. Norris, Joh. (University College School); 18, J. E. Browne, Sidney (Tiverton), G. Osborn, Emman. (Kingswood and Eastbourne); 20, H. Douglas, King's (Eton), C. S. Vaughan, Trin. (Harrow); 22, W. W. Bryant, Pemb. (Brampton), F. Sergeant, Trin. (Derby); 23, R. Ll. Jones, Corpus (Breen); 25, H. O. Fox, King's (Marlborough), A. Thornton Christ's (Giggleswick); 26, H. H. Holland, Sidney (Walsall); 27, G. F. Perrott, Jes. (Ealing); 28, H. W. Saw, King's (Blackheath), G. F. C. Searle, Pet. (Pr. Tuit.); 30, W. J. Sharples, Queen's (Manchester). *Senior Optima:* 1, S. F. Card, Joh.; 2, A. Robinson, Jes.; 3, C. E. Holland, Christ's; 4, J. A. Hay, Clare, R. A. T. Stevens, Trin. H.; 6, J. Carter, Trin., J. T. Jolley, Cath.; 8, W. Dunn, Trin.; 9, W. O. Duncan, Pemb., C. W. Herbert, Trin., H. S. Mundahl, Joh.; 12, H. N. Hopgood, Trin.; 13, H. Hancock, Joh.; 14, H. G. N. Foyster, Trin., H. E. Pownell, Pet.; 16, E. L. Hartley, Pemb.; 17, W. H. N. Hope, Trin., E. Kitchener, Christ's; 19, H. J. T. Bake, Jes., J. W. Bragg, Emman.; 21, W. A. Russell, Joh.; 22, H. J. R. Lawrence, Trin. H.; 23, E. G. Allport, Christ's, J. N. Bentfield, Trin.; 25, H. H. Cooper, Joh., E. F. Hadfield, H. Selw.; 27, S. Symonds, Cath.; 28, A. H. Summers, Cath.; 29, E. B. Badcock, Sidney; 30, R. P. Marriott, Cath.; 31, J. G. Garnett, Cath.; 32, B. L. Lewis-Lloyd, Jes.; 33, G. S. Back, Trin., C. C. T. Perez, Clare; 35, N. W. Cumpson, Queens', H. F. Neshitt, Clare; 37, W. E. Bryan, Trin., C. Marsh, Clare. *Women:* H. Browne, Newnham (bracketed with 12); B. A. Holme, Girton (bracketed with 16); M. S. Raymond, Girton (between 18 and 19); B. Whalley, Girton (bracketed with 22); E. Walters, Newnham (between 22 and 23); M. Atkins, Newnham (bracketed with 25); M. S. Richards, Newnham (between 30 and 31); K. T. Wallas, Girton (bracketed with 32).

MORAL SCIENCES TRIPOS.—*Second Class:* E. E. Goodacre, Joh., J. R. W. Mowbray, Joh., A. N. Stapley, Joh. *Women:* *Second Class:* A. M. Anderson, Girton, C. R. Collins, Girton, M. E. Lowndes, Girton, M. C. Sturge, Newnham.

MATHEMATICAL TRIPOS, Part II.—*Class I. Division 1:* C. W. C. Barlow, Pet. (Edinburgh), G. H. Bryan, Pet., A. C. Dixon, Trin. (Kingswood), W. C. Fletcher, Joh. (Kingswood), C. Platts, Trin. (City of London and University College, London). *Division 2:* W. M. Coates, Queen's (Trinity College, Dublin), F. W. Hill, Joh. (Manchester); *Division 3:* J. Clark, Pemb. (Aberdeen), H. G. Dawson, Christ's (Trinity College, Dublin).

Class II. Division 1: E. H. Askwith, Trin. (Christ's Hospital); *Division 2:* J. P. Johnson, Pet. (Trinity College, Dublin), A. M. Aubrey, Caius-Kingswood and Owens College, W. Nicolls, Pet. (Trinity College, Dublin); *Division 3:* J. Tate, Joh. (Belfast).

SEMITIC LANGUAGES TRIPOS.—*Class I:* A. A. Ivan, Trin.

Class II: H. S. Alken, Queen's.

LAW TRIPOS.—*Class I:* 1, G. G. Alexander, Down. (Priv. Tuit.), T. A. Herbert, Joh. (Mill Hill and Owens College), G. J. R. Murray, Trin., J. Windsor, Joh. (Owens College); 5, W. Archbold, Pet.; 6, W. Summers, Trin.; 7, H. E. Wright, Trin. (Cheltenham); 8, T. E. Chisenhale-Marsh, Trin. (Eton); 9, W. Barrington, Trin.

Class II: 1, G. Grey, Joh., J. C. Ingle, King's, R. Lyle, Trin. H.; 4, E. H. Mallet, King's, D. J. Wanliss, Trin.; 6, R. A. Sharp, King's; 7, S. J. W. N. Greenidge, Joh., L. R. Holland, King's, T. F. Howell, Joh., H. J. Morgan, Trin. H.; 11, G. N. Hind, Joh., Count G. N. Strickland, Trin.; 12, P. Yasuhiro.

NATURAL SCIENCES TRIPOS, Part I.—H. C. Anderson, Cai. (Harrow), C. A. Berber, Chr. (Kingswood), E. K. Colbeck, Cai. (Wellington College, N.Z.), J. P. d'Albuquerque, Joh. (City of London), S. F. Dufton, Trin. (Bradford), A. Dufton, Non. Coll. (Bradford), W. T. Elliott, Chr. (Newcastle), A. G. Francis, King's (University College School), R. E. Fry, King's (Clifton), M. Grahame, Joh., T. T. Groom, Joh. (University College, London), H. Richardson, King's (Priv. Tuit.), F. R. Tenant, Cai. (Newcastle, Staff.), F. M. Turner, Trin. (City of London), E. P. Waggett, Pemb. (Charterhouse), W. H. Wagstaff, Sid. (Merchant Taylors'), C. E. Williams, Cai.

Class II: F. E. Batten, Trin., A. E. Bollington, Cai., J. W. Campbell, Cav., C. Cargill, Jes., A. Carling, Joh., C. A. Carus-Wilson, Pemb., R. F. d'Arcy, Cai., H. E. Davies, Cai., J. R. Ellis, Trin., W. C. P. Ellis, Cath., T. H. Evans, Joh., G. E. Hale, King's, A. S. Hall, Cai., C. P. Handson, Cai., J. F. Hartin, Down., T. H. Haydon, Cai., W. M. Hayward, Sid., S. Herbert, Cai., H. L. Joseland, Chr., A. F. Kellett, Joh., S. M. Kingdon, Chr., S. H. A. Lambert, Joh., W. S. Lazarus-Barlow, Down., F. C. Martley, Trin., J. Owen, Sid., S. Parkes, Emman., G. Percival, Joh., H. G. L. Pryce, Pemb., C. E. Rice, Cai., E. A. Shaw, King's, W. W. Stabb, Cai., J. H. Staines, Sid., J. W. W. Stephens, Cai., J. D. Stubbs, Trin., C. R. A. Sutton, Cla., T. J. Watts, Queens', D. Wessels, King's, W. S. West, Joh., J. H. Wilks, Cai., A. E. Wright, Trin., J. C. Wright, Joh.

Women.—*Class I:* E. E. Field, Newnham, A. J. Flavell, Newnham, M. M. Smith, Newnham.

Class II: J. C. Fortey, Newnham, E. R. Saunders, Newnham, M. A. Sewell, Newnham, C. L. Skeat, Newnham, J. C. Vinter, Girton.

Part II.: 1, R. H. Adie (Chemistry), Trin. (Royal School of Mines and Int. Coll., London), W. Couldridge (Chemistry), Emman. (Exeter), A. C. Durham (Physiology), Christ's (University College School), F. H. Edgeworth (Physiology), Cai. (Clifton), P. Lake (Geology), Joh. (Newcastle College of Science), W. S. Melsome (Physiology), Owens (Lancing), A. B. Kettle (Botany), Joh. (Southwick), G. S. Turpin (Chemistry), Joh. (Nottingham and Owens College); 2, J. C. H. Blake, Trin., A. Campbell, Corpus, A. W. Day, Caius, H. E. Durham, King's, H. M. Fletcher, Trin., P. P. Groom, Trin., F. Hird, Trin., H. A. Roberts, Caius.

HISTORICAL TRIPOS.—*Class I:* 1, G. T. Warner, Jes. (Newton Abbott); 2, E. Jenks, King's (Dulwich), J. E. Kenball, King's (King's College, London); 4, J. P. Maleson, Trin.; 5, C. A. Houfe, Queen's. *Women:* M. Bateson, Newnham (between 1 and 2), E. C. Moore, Newnham (equal to 4), M. K. Griffiths, Newnham (equal to 4).

Class II: 1, W. A. Lewis, King's; 2, R. Bickersteth, Pemb., T. M. Evans, King's; 4, G. R. Sanders, Trin.; 5, H. C. S. Dumas, Trin. Hall, S. H. Hargrave, Trin., W. G. Selwyn, King's; 8, H. J. Carpenter, King's. *Women:* B. Paull, Newnham (equal to 1), K. J. Pattinson, Newnham (between 4 and 5), E. A. Beldington, Newnham (equal to 5).

The Classical Review

OCTOBER 1887.

SCHEME FOR A CATALOGUE OF GREEK AND LATIN CLASSICAL MANUSCRIPTS.

IN accordance with a suggestion made in a former number of the *Classical Review* (pp. 38 foll.), it is proposed to print from time to time brief descriptions of the Classical MSS. in Greek and Latin which exist in public and private libraries, at home in the first instance, and (possibly) also abroad. By this means useful material for reference will be brought together, and in the end a fairly complete catalogue may be formed. The success of the scheme must, however, depend entirely upon co-operation. It is proposed to commence with the MSS. of Greek poets, keeping as far as possible to the chronological order, and the Editor would be glad to receive (1) information as to the existence of such MSS. from librarians and others, (2) names of persons who would be willing to assist in drawing up the descriptive catalogue. The scheme which follows, together with the (imaginary) examples by which it is illustrated, was drawn up by Mr. E. Maunde Thompson, and has received the approval of some of the best English palaeographers. Information under all the heads which are here laid down cannot of course be expected in every instance; but it is hoped that they are exact and wide enough to take in all the points that need to be recorded—

Form of Descriptions.

General description of the MS.:

State (1) the number or designation of the MS.; (2) the material on which it is written; (3) the number of leaves, and of columns (if two or more); (4) the measurement of the leaves; (5) the character of the writing; (6) the date or period, and, if possible, where written; (7) the history of the MS. and names of former owners. Note anything of external interest, as binding, &c.

NO. VIII. VOL. I.

Description of contents:

If a Greek MS., the titles to be in Greek (*not* Latin).

If a Latin MS., the titles to be in Latin.

If titles are given in the MS., quote them between inverted commas.

If the MS. contains more than one poem or treatise, give the reference to the leaf of the MS. on which each begins, and, if it is imperfect, state where it begins or ends.

The recto side of a leaf to be indicated by the number simply, as f. 60.

The verso side, by the number and letter *b*, as f. 60 *b*.

Bibliography.

Reference to any particular feature, such as the existence of scholia or annotations, corrections, lacunae, &c., to follow.

At the end describe briefly any special ornamentation.

Examples.

LIBRIAN.

BRIT. MUS. **Harley MS.** 0000. Vellum; ff. 134. 12 × 8¾ inches. Minuscules, above the ruled lines. x cent.

Belonged, in 15th cent. to Jo. Chalceophylus of Constantinople; afterwards to Antonius Serapandus (*ob.* 1539), Jan de Witt (*circ.* 1700), Jan van der Mark of Utrecht, and John Bridges. Purchased by Lord Harley, 1726.

Bound in boards covered with stamped leather.

1. ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐν τῇ προσαγορεύσει πταίσματος.
f. 1.

Imperf.; begins in § 8.

2. “ἀπολογία περὶ τῶν ἐπὶ μισθῷ συνόντων.”
f. 2.

3. “ἁρμονίδης.” f. 6 *b*.

Imperf.; ends in § 2.

[and so on through the vol.]

Collations in ed. Hemsterhuis, 1743–46. Cod E. in Fritsch's ed. 1860–74. See Cat. Anc. MSS.

Two quires are lost after f. 64. Scholia in the margins in half-uncials.

Very handsome initial letters in gold and colours.

VIRGIL.

BRIT. MUS., Add. MS. 00000. Vellum; ff. 150, in double columns. $6 \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ inches. Lombardic minuscules. Written in Italy; A.D. 1194.

Belonged, in 14th cent. to St. Augustine's monastery, Canterbury; and in 1800 to Thomas Crane, minister of St. Olave, Chester. See Cat. Add. MSS.

1. *Bucolica*. f. 4.
2. "*Georgica*"; with arguments attributed to Ovid. f. 13 b.

3. *Æneis*; with arguments, &c. f. 38.

Copious scholia and glosses, the greater part contemporary, the remainder in French and English hands of various dates down to the fifteenth century. Three quires (or twenty-four leaves) are lost from the beginning of the volume, the quire signatures now beginning with sig. iv. A cutting, containing a miniature, from a French MS. of the thirteenth century, has been inserted at the beginning.

WEIL'S DEMOSTHENES.

Les Plaidoyers Politiques de Demosthène.
Par HENRI WEIL. Deuxième Série.
Androtion, Aristocrate, Timocrate, Aristogiton. Paris: Hachette et C^{ie}. 1886. 8 fr.

THOSE who are acquainted with the two preceding volumes of Weil's *Demosthenes* (published respectively in 1873 and 1887) will welcome this latest instalment of so important a work. Weil stands among the foremost of Greek scholars in France. He is conspicuous for good sense and sobriety as a commentator, for a wide historical knowledge, and for an admirable literary judgment. His Introductions exhibit the oratorical structure of the speeches and the occasions which called them forth with singular penetration and insight. He is familiar with the most recent researches in the departments of archaeology and law, and his pages embody these results without being overweighted by detail.

The critical notes appended to the text include a new and valuable collation of the Parisian manuscript S. Weil, while appreciating the clear superiority of S over all other MSS., does not follow it with the blind devotion of the Zurich editors. But it seems to be rather sound commonsense than a delicate and sympathetic comprehension of the language or a thorough mastery of its idioms that guides him aright. When we look for critical or grammatical elucidation we become aware that his strength lies in other directions. The niceties of syntax and the finer shades of meaning either escape him or fail to interest him. In scholarly exactness and completeness his notes generally fall behind those of Wayte in his very useful edition of the *Androtion* and *Timocrates* (Cambridge University Press,

1882). We might instance *Androtion*, § 3 (παρὰ μικρόν), *Timocr.* § 195 (οὐδ' ὀλίγον δεῖ), *Timocr.* § 196 (πολλόστ' χρόνῳ), *Timocr.* § 39 (εἰ with subjunctive in a legal document). In questions affecting the text it is almost part of Weil's manner not to give the reasons which determine his critical judgment. We desire to see the process and he only gives us the conclusion. Thus it happens that he sacrifices thoroughness to studied brevity, as in *Aristocr.* § 165, τὸν μὲν ἅπαντα χρόνον μῆνας ἐπὶ διήγαγεν ἡμᾶς πολεμῶν. Here S has ἡμᾶς (kept by Weil). A ἡμῖν, while Cobet (*M.C.* p. 541) would read πρὸς ἡμᾶς. It may plausibly be argued that ἡμᾶς is the mistake of a transcriber who was familiar with the late Greek phrase, πολεμεῖν τινα, whereas Demosthenes knows only πολεμεῖν τινὲς or πρὸς τινα. On the other hand διάγειν is sometimes used in a causative sense, e.g. in *de Cor.* § 89, ὁ πόλεμος ἐν πάσι τοῖς κατὰ τὸν βίον ἀφθονωτέροις καὶ εὐνοϊότεροις διήγειν ἡμᾶς, 'the war kept you in a better and cheaper supply of all the necessities of life.' It is not impossible that διήγαγεν ἡμᾶς πολεμῶν should mean 'kept us in a state of warfare,' where πολεμοῦντας or ἐν πολέμῳ would have been the more natural expression. Reiske following *Etym. Magn.* would give διήγαγε the meaning of ἐξηπάτησε, a conjecture based presumably on the use of διαγωγή, 'amusement,' 'entertainment.' But διαγωγή belongs to διάγειν in its connection with χρόνον, 'a pastime,' and lends no support to διάγειν = ἐξαπατᾶν. Weil, however, accepts the alleged usage without stating the authority on which it rests, and without arguing the case. He merely translates 'il nous amusa en nous faisant la guerre,' and proceeds to remark on the ironical turn of the phrase.

Again, we miss some critical discussion of *Aristocr.* § 117, ταύτην ἂν ἐμοὶ χρήσθε συμβούλῳ φυλάξετε τὴν πίστιν πρὸς τοῦτον τὸν Θράκα, καὶ μὴ βουλήσεσθε εἰδέναι τίνα ἂν...πρὸς ὑμᾶς σχοίῃ γνώμην. Weil here, like most previous editors, admits without demur an abnormal and startling bit of syntax. His note is, 'καὶ μὴ βουλήσεσθε equivalent to καὶ μὴ βούλεσθε.' The fut. indic. is accompanied by μὴ owing to the imperative sense of the proposition. Cf. *Aristoph. Plut.* 488, μαλακὸν δ' ἐνδύσσετε μηδέν.' A reference, however, to the context of *Plutus*, 488, will show that μαλακὸν δ' ἐνδύσσετε μηδέν need not be taken as an independent clause containing a direct prohibition, but forms part of a relative sentence. The relative ὃ is carried on from the preceding νικήσετε to ἐνδύσσετε. Some other supposed examples of this use of μὴ may be similarly disposed of: e.g. *Soph. Ajax*, 572, μήτε...θήσουσι, where the future depends on a preceding ὅπως. No sure inference can be based on Menander, *Mon.* 572, ξένον ἀδικήσεις μηδέποτε καιρὸν λαβών, or on *Eur. Med.* 822, λέξεις δὲ μηδὲν τῶν ἐμοὶ δεδογμένων, as in each case the fut. indic. differs only from the aorist subjunct. by ε instead of η. (Yet it must be owned that in both these instances the harshness of the fut. indic. is modified by the position of the negative following instead of preceding the verb). There remains, however, one passage which cannot be evaded or emended, *Lysias* xxix. § 13, εἰς δὲ εὖ φρονήτε, καὶ νυνὶ τοῦτο φανερόν...ποιήσετε...καὶ μηδεμίαν αὐτοῖς ἄδειαν δώσετε. Comparing the close resemblance between the structure of this sentence and the passage in *Aristocr.* we may perhaps be driven to accept the usage, however rare, as genuine, and to give it a place beside certain other eccentric but well-established combinations, e.g. μὴ with fut. indic. in oaths in Homer, and μὴ with opt., and ἂν in Attic prose and verse. If it were not for the quotation from *Lysias* it would be far more tempting to read βούλεσθε with Bekker in *Aristocr.* § 117.

Weil as a rule cannot be charged with a superstitious respect for MSS. authority where it is in conflict with commonsense or invariable usage. But surely in *Aristocr.* § 33, he is mistaken in reverting to the MSS. reading. The orator is here explaining the archaic word ἀποιῶν, 'to fine' (cf. Homeric ποινή) which occurs in one of the laws relating to homicide: τὸ δὲ μηδ' ἀποιῶν [λέγει] μὴ χρήματα πράττεσθαι. τὰ γὰρ ἄποινα χρημάτων ὀνόμαζον οἱ παλαιοί. Obviously in the last clause ἄποινα and χρήματα ought to change places, so that the clause will run,

τὰ γὰρ χρήματα ἄποινα ὀνόμαζον οἱ παλαιοί, 'the ancients called a pecuniary penalty ἄποινα'; and so in fact the words are quoted by Theon. *Prolog.* iv. 15. Almost all editors since Reiske have adopted this necessary correction. It is a mistaken subtlety by which Weil attempts to justify the order of the words as they stand in the MSS., 'the ancients designated money by the term (τὰ) ἄποινα.' The passage cited by him is not parallel, and we may safely say that no Greek ear could have tolerated this complete inversion of an every-day phrase.

A clause in *Timocr.* § 42 has been needlessly debated and frequently misunderstood owing to the neglect of a simple idiom. [Διοκλῆς εἶπε] τοὺς μετ' Εὐκλείδην τεθέντας [νόμους] καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν τιθεμένους κυρίους εἶναι ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας ἧς ἕκαστος ἐτέθη πλὴν εἴ τῳ προσγέγραπται χρόνος ὅντινα δεῖ ἄρχεῖν. The sense obviously is '[Diocles moved] that the laws which were passed after Eucleides and such as are hereafter passed, shall come into force from the day on which each was passed, except where a time has been expressly specified, at which the law is to come into operation.' But doubts have been raised as to the construction of ὅντινα δεῖ ἄρχεῖν. Wayte is clearly right in dismissing the interpretation (adopted even by C. R. Kennedy), 'in whose archonship a law is to commence,' according to which ἄρχεῖν = ἄρχοντα εἶναι, and ὅντινα = 'what person.' The noun to be supplied with ὅντινα is as he says χρόνον. But he himself, apparently, takes νόμον as the subject to ἄρχεῖν. Two objections to this at once occur: (1) the accus. ὅντινα, to mark the point of time, (2) ἄρχεῖν for ἄρχεσθαι, which Wayte seeks to justify. But the passages he quotes (*Thucyd.* iv. 118, and v. 19) are instances of the strict use of ἄρχεῖν. All difficulty disappears as soon as we recognize that ὅντινα χρόνον is subject to ἄρχεῖν, so that the full phrase would be ὅντινα χρόνον δεῖ ἄρχεῖν (τοῦ κύριον εἶναι τὸν νόμον) lit. 'what time is to mark the beginning (of the law coming into force),' i.e. 'from what time the operation of the law is to date.' For the act. voice cf. *Thucyd.* iv. 118, 6, τὴν ἐκχειρίαν εἶναι ἐνιαυτόν, ἄρχεῖν δὲ τήνδε τὴν ἡμέραν (sc. τῆς ἐκχειρίας), 'that this day marks the beginning of (the truce)'; not 'that the truce begins this day,' which would be ἄρχεσθαι. So *Thucyd.* v. 19, 1, ἄρχει δὲ τῶν σπονδῶν ἔφορος Πλειστόλας, 'the ephorality of Pleistolas marks the date of the treaty.' The day from which a law or treaty dates is strictly said ἄρχεῖν, with a gen. of the object, 'to initiate it,' 'to mark its commencement.' Weil rightly explains

the clause in the *Timocrates* but with a brevity which is tantalizing. A good comment on the construction is supplied by Demosthenes himself in the next section, where he quotes with a slight variation the words of the law: *κελεύει γὰρ ἕκαστον ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας ἐτέθη κύριον εἶναι, πλὴν εἴ τῳ χρόνος προσγέγραπται, τούτῳ δὲ τὸν γεγραμμένον ἄρχειν*, '...except where a time has been expressly specified, and in the case of such a law the specified time is to begin it,' i.e. is to mark the date at which it comes into operation. The last clause is in itself decisive against some of the false interpretations.

Aristocr. § 96 furnishes us with an instructive variety of the conditional sentence, one however which the editors pass over in silence. The instances in prose of the past ind. with *ἂν* to denote not what would have happened under imaginary conditions, but what must have happened under actual conditions, are sufficiently rare to claim attention. The passage referred to runs thus: *οἷον εἴ τι τῶν ἡλωκότων ψηφισμάτων παρ' ὑμῖν μὴ ἐγράφη, κύριον ἂν δῆπουθεν ἦν· καὶ μὴν παρὰ τοὺς νόμους γ' ἂν εἶρητο*. Whereas the clause *κύριον ἂν ἦν* is an ordinary unfulfilled condition, 'would have been still in force,' the clause *παρὰ τοὺς νόμους γ' ἂν εἶρητο* is not an unfulfilled condition; for, as the immediate context shows, the illegal decrees had actually been carried. The literal rendering is 'and yet *ex hypothesi* (*ἂν*) it had been moved contrary to law.'

Repeated negatives in Greek sometimes give rise to puzzling questions, but in *Timocr.* § 28 there is no possible reason for hesitation: *ἵνα μὴ προαισθομένον μηδενὸς...τεθείη...ὁ νόμος*. Madvig would omit *μὴ* on the ground that it would negative *τεθείη*. Wayte does not pronounce definitely upon the point. Weil keeps *μὴ* but does not defend or illustrate it. Yet *μὴ* reinforced by *μηδενὸς* merely conforms to the general principle which governs repeated negatives, namely, that accumulated negatives in Greek do not cancel one another so long as the added negative adds a new idea. The double negative with the participle here is precisely similar to *Timocr.* § 46, *οὐ προτεθέντος οὐδέως περὶ τούτων*. Nothing could be more regular. A real irregularity, on the other hand, occurs in *Androt.* § 32 (where neither Weil nor Wayte has a note), *οὐδ' ἂν ὦσιν ἔτ' Ἀνδροτιμῶνός τινες αἰσχρὸν βεβιωκότες οὐκ ἔστι λέγειν κακῶς τοὺς ἄρχοντας*. Here *οὐκ* following *οὐδὲ* merely repeats instead of cancelling the negative idea. So too in *Mid.* § 129, *Against Phormio*, § 2. In each of these cases, however, the protasis of a conditional

sentence intervenes between the *οὐδὲ* and the *οὐκ*, a fact which accounts for the resumption of the negative. *À propos* of negatives, it is worth referring to the construction of *τοῦ* with infin. in a final sense, where the omission of the negative is as rare and exceptional in Classical Greek as it is characteristic of Hellenistic usage. The editors do not mark the distinction. On *Timocr.* § 36, *ἐκτιθέναι κελεύει τοῦ προειδέναι πάντας*, Weil's note is, 'genitive marking the motive cf. *de Cor.* § 107, *ἀναλῶσαι τοῦ μὴ τὰ δίκαια ποιεῖν ἐθέλειν*.' It would be more to the point to quote *Timocr.* § 133, *ἐπιβουλεύων τοῦ πιστευθῆναι*, *Steph. I.* § 41, *τοῦ βεβαίαν αὐτῷ τὴν ἀπαλλαγὴν εἶναι*.

The study of inscriptions has thrown new light on many documents of disputed authenticity which are inserted in the text of Demosthenes, and Weil has made good use of this important aid. In the law quoted, *Timocr.* § 33, the name *πρόεδροι* is applied to the Presidents of the board of the *Nomothetae*. This had been held to be a forger's blunder. The *πρόεδροι*, it was said, presided only over the Ecclesia, while the *Nomothetae* were presided over by the *Thesmothetae*. But an inscription published by Koumanoudis in *Ἀθήναιον* (1876, p. 179) dispels all doubts, and proves that the *Nomothetae* had their own *πρόεδροι* and their own *ἐπιστάτης*. The inscription which is of the age of Demosthenes is a decree conferring the right of citizenship on a certain Peisitheides of Delos. It concludes thus: *ἐν δὲ τοῖς νομοθέταις τ[οὺς προέ]δρους οἱ ἂν προεδρεύωσιν [καὶ τὸν ἐ]πιστάτην προσνομοθετεῖν*... Another and more famous document that has been rejected is the Oath of the Heliasts as handed down to us in *Timocr.* § 149. It would be too much to say that the document as a whole is now placed beyond suspicion; but, at least, many of the grounds on which it has been rejected are seen to be wholly inadequate; nay, it so happens that one of the suspected clauses of the oath has been strikingly corroborated by an inscription of Calymnia, now in the British Museum, published by C. T. Newton in 1883 (*Gk. Inser. in B. M.* vol. ii. no. 290. See also *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, March 1886). The clause is this: *οὐδὲ δῶρα δεῖσθαι τῆς ἡλιασείας ἕνεκα οὐτ' αὐτὸς ἐγὼ οὐτ' ἄλλος ἐμοὶ οὐτ' ἄλλη αἰδότος ἐμοῦ οὐτε τέχνη οὐτε μηχανῇ οὐδεμίᾳ*. The oath of the judges of Unidus contained in the inscription above mentioned is couched in almost identical terms: *οὐδὲ δῶρα λαβόν τῆς δίκας ἐ[γ]κεν οἵτ' αὐτὸς ἐγὼ οὐτε ἄλλος οὐτε ἄλλα ἐμ[ί]ν οὐ μηχανῇ οὐδ' ἐμ[ί]ᾳ*. On the whole it seems likely that epigraphic science will undo much

of the hasty work of destructive criticism here as in other fields of inquiry. Classical antiquity is still being reconstructed; and every day we have opportunity of observing how preposterous it is to argue from our own ignorance about certain constitutional usages or legal formulae to their non-existence. Nothing is easier and nothing is more unscientific than to introduce an ignorant forger, as a *deus ex machina*, to save us from some conclusion forced upon us by our own defective knowledge. The legal documents inserted in the text of Demosthenes have been too often dealt with in this fashion, and examples might be multiplied in which the very phrase impugned turns out to be a mark of authenticity. Not a few of these documents when read in the light of inscriptions are likely to hold their place as authentic records of the fourth century, B.C.

Quite of another kind is the question of authenticity raised by the speech *Against Aristogeiton I.* (The speech *Against Aristogeiton II.* is given up by all competent critics). Here we have a problem which must be decided mainly upon literary grounds, and the most recent critics are so entirely at variance as to the character and merits of the speech that scholarship might well be inclined to despair of its task. Dionysius of Halicarnassus pronounced the speech not to be the work of Demosthenes; later writers, such as Hermogenes, Photius, Pliny the Younger, reversed that decision. Modern scholars have been almost unanimous in rejecting the speech. Dobree, Westermann, Arnold Schaefer, are here agreed. Blass, too, in his *Attische Bereds.* iii. p. 361-3 denies that it can be the work of Demosthenes, or even of a writer contemporary with Demosthenes. Nor, he thinks, can the speech have been made in a real law-case. We learn, however, with no small surprise from Weil that Blass in a private letter to him has now recanted this view, and is of opinion that the speech cannot be ascribed to any other than Demosthenes, but that it was a mere exercise or *μελέτη*, never delivered, and not intended for publication. And as Blass is thus pitted against himself, so is Dobree against Cobet. Where Dobree is convinced that we have the declamation of a sophist, Cobet traces the hand of Hypereides. Weil, however, adduces cogent reasons against the authorship of Hypereides, and

concludes his interesting examination of the speech by attributing it to Demosthenes. But his literary sense is too just to admit of his being insensible to the startling differences which separate *Aristogeiton I.* from the normal style and manner of Demosthenes. These he explains partly on a theory of interpolations, partly by other considerations which are not without weight.

Yet after all due allowances are made, most students of Demosthenes will probably find that the total effect of the composition is essentially different from the impression left by the genuine work of the orator. This or that passage may be highly Demosthenic, worthy of Demosthenes, if not from his pen; the whole speech, it may be granted, is far above the level of the average sophist. We may even find parallels for the most audacious metaphors, the coarsest invective, the most grotesque phrases, in detached passages of the *de Corona* or of the *Falsa Legatio*. Almost all the elements that offend us here may be discovered singly elsewhere. The difference, it may be said, is merely one of degree. Yes, but such a difference may be vital and fundamental, though it is impossible to mark a given point at which the adverse conviction becomes irresistible. While we are content to argue the matter in detail, we may easily persuade ourselves that there is nothing which Demosthenes might not have written. But granting that he might have written the parts, could he have written the whole? No one can pretend to give a dogmatic answer. We cannot get beyond individual impressions, which, however strong, are incommunicable. It is one of the incidents of literary criticism, especially in dealing with ancient literature, that it has no final or rigorous test for separating genuine work from spurious. In the absence of anachronisms or of archaeological inaccuracies, such as would at once condemn a composition, the only appeal is to the trained instinct and judgment of a few—a few, however, who in course of generations become many, and whose verdict on questions of taste and literary appreciation tends to a unanimity far beyond what might have been expected. Meanwhile, among the few, Weil is one of those with whom one is most reluctant, however rarely, to differ.

S. H. BUTCHER.

CAUSERET'S RHETORIC OF CICERO.

Étude sur la langue de la rhétorique et de la critique littéraire dans Cicéron, par CHARLES CAUSERET. 8vo. 245 pp. Paris (Hachette), 1886. 4 fr.

THIS elaborate and comprehensive treatise deserves the warmest welcome from all who are interested in the study of the rhetorical works of Cicero. It supplies in the systematic form of a well-arranged manual of rhetoric an almost complete conspectus of all the technical terms used by the greatest of Roman orators in treating of those matters of rhetorical criticism on which he has still a pre-eminent right to a respectful hearing.

The Introduction (pp. 1—34) briefly reviews the rhetorical works of Cicero, states the general aim of the treatise, and gives some account of the modern literature of the subject. The first part of the treatise itself (pp. 37—80), deals with a variety of preliminary details, such as the three classes of speeches, deliberative, forensic and epideictic; the contrast between *θέσις* and *ὑπόθεσις*; and the *status causarum* with all their subdivisions. The second (pp. 81—206) treats of the five parts of rhetoric, *inventio*, *dispositio*, *elocutio*, *actio* and *memoria*, with the subordinate details of each. The conclusion (pp. 207—210) dwells on the difficulties encountered by Cicero in his endeavour to translate into Latin the technical terms of the Greek rhetoricians; and points out the scrupulous pains that he spent on surmounting those difficulties instead of shirking them by a mere transcription of the original, such as is not unfrequent in Quintilian, and extremely common in Latin rhetoricians of later date and of minor importance. The volume closes with a comprehensive index of Greek and Latin words, a separate index of Latin phrases, and a clearly arranged table of contents.

The author shows a wide acquaintance with the Greek and Latin writers on the subject, and occasionally intersperses his quotations from their pages with interesting and suggestive criticisms of his own. He thus presents us with more than is promised on his title-page; for, while Cicero remains 'the essential object and the centre' of his work, it may fairly claim to be what the author calls 'une étude comparative des termes de la rhétorique et de la critique

littéraire, en usage chez les Grecs et chez les Romains.'

M. Causeret appears to have used no other editions of the rhetorical works of Cicero besides those of Piderit. If he had consulted others, it might have lightened his labour in collecting illustrative references from the Greek and Roman rhetoricians; and have saved him from falling into occasional error. It is also a pity that he has not used the latest edition of Volkmann's *Rhetorik* (1885) instead of that of 1874. He might thus have avoided attributing to that writer (on page 150), views on the early history of the three kinds of style, the *genus dicendi tenue*, *grave* and *medium*, which he now no longer holds (p. 532, edition 1885); nor would he have assigned the treatise *περὶ ἐμπνεύσεως* to Demetrius Phalereus: the only German who has recently endeavoured to maintain that hypothesis having been conclusively refuted by one of his own countrymen (*ib.* 538). M. Causeret has carefully collected the passages in which Cicero compares the rhetoric of the schools to a peaceful pageant or the drill of the parade-ground, and the practical eloquence of public life to battle under a burning sun; further illustrations may be found in a pamphlet on the metaphors from military life in the rhetorical works of Cicero, Quintilian and Tacitus, which was probably published too late to be of use in the preparation of this part of his work (D. Wollner, Landau, 1886). He omits to notice the frequent use of illustrations from the arts of painting and sculpture in the criticism of oratorical style, which is touched upon in my edition of the *Orator*, pp. lxxiii and 5. It is quite as curious, in its way, as the modern mannerism of borrowing metaphors from painting, such as 'light and shade,' in the criticism of music; and metaphors from music, such as 'tone' and 'harmony,' in the criticism of painting.

The general value of the work is so great that it is not impaired to any serious extent by the small inaccuracies that have found their way into some of its numerous details. M. Causeret is aware that there was more than one Ernesti; as a matter of fact there were three: J. A. Ernesti, the editor of Cicero and Tacitus (1707—1781); A. W. Ernesti, his nephew, an editor of Livy (1733—1801); and J. C. T. Ernesti, the

compiler of the *lexicon technologiae Graecorum et Latinorum rhetoricae* (1756—1802). On p. 156, he rightly calls the first of these (the author of the *Clavis Ciceroniana*), *l'aîné des Ernesti*; but, on p. 14, the author of the *lexicon technologiae* is misleadingly described as *l'illustre latiniste Ernesti*, a designation which inevitably recalls the first and far the most distinguished of the three. On p. 13 we have the singular spelling *eloquutio*; on pp. 47, 48, *stylus*; on p. 175, *moestitia*. On p. 7, *sitne?* is misprinted; on pp. 9, 31, 33, the *praenomen* of Piderit is printed *Wilhem*. On p. 49 it is said that *declamatio* does not occur in the works of Cicero, whereas it is found in *pro Murena* 44, *pro Plancio* 47, and in *Tusc. Disp.* 7; the statement was probably meant to be confined to the rhetorical works alone. On p. 98, *venae*, which is sometimes coupled with *viscera* 'the heart,' is itself explained as meaning 'proprement les entrailles; d'où: les sentiments intimes de chacun, teneat oportet venas cuiusque generis, aetatis, ordinis,' de Or. i § 223; but the author might have found a better rendering in Prof. Wilkins' note: 'he must have his finger on the pulse, i.e. he must be familiar with the character.' On p. 115, Or. 127 only explains the use of *extenuare* in the peroration, but the word itself is not to be found there; it occurs among the figures of speech in § 137. On p. 127, *Brut.* 32 and Or. 175 are both of them quoted in support of the statement that, according to Cicero, the credit of being the first to introduce rhythm into prose belongs to Thrasy Machus of Chalcedon, *et surtout à Isocrate*; whereas the first of these passages, which assigns the credit to Isocrates, is tacitly corrected in the second, which assigns it to Thrasy Machus (cf. pp. lxx and 196 of my edition of the *Orator*). The reference to *De Or.* iii 190, on p. 131, is not really (as is implied), an instance of *fluens* being contrasted with *rhythmicus*. On p. 135 the last reference for *orbis* (*verborum*) should be Or. 234. In Or. 173, quoted on p. 139, *brevitas* is applied to syllables, not (as stated) to periods.

Acquiescere in Or. 199 is not a true parallel to *conquiescere* in *De Or.* iii 191; for the latter alone refers to the close of the period, while the former is applied to the audience (p. 141). To the references for *minutus* on p. 149 may be added Or. §§ 39, 231. In the quotation from Macrobius on p. 151, *luxuriatur* is omitted after *Symmachus*. The instance of the metaphorical use of *sanguis*, quoted as from Quintilian (x 1 § 115) on p. 157, is itself simply a quotation from the *Brutus* 283, *verum sanguinem*

deperdebat. On p. 159 *naturalis color* (*Brut.* 36) ought to be *naturalis non fucatus nitor*. On p. 161 another instance of the metaphorical use of *excelsus* may be added from Or. 119; on the same page the *Orator* is accidentally called a 'dialogue.' To the examples of *argutus* on p. 162, may be added Or. §§ 38, 39, 42, and (*argute*) 98. On pp. 174—5 *nitidus*, *incultus* and *horridus* are quoted from Or. 36 as applied to style; they are really there applied to paintings. On p. 175 for *impexis* read *impexa*. For the metaphorical use of *flores* (p. 180), add *Brut.* 17 § 66. On p. 181, on metaphor, prefix iii to *De Or.* 38, 156. On p. 183, *commoratio*, complete the reference to *ad Herennium* (iv 45 § 58): and, on the next page, in the account of *extenuatio*, insert *ad Her.* iv 38 § 50. Lastly, on p. 188, add *plerumque* before *convertimus* in the quotation from *Aquila Romanus*.

M. Causeret has frequent occasion to quote the Greek rhetoricians for parallels to Cicero's technical terms, and for other purposes. Most of these quotations are thoroughly to the point, but the first of them is somewhat injudicious. For the etymology of *ῥητορικὴ* we are told on p. 37 to consult the anonymous scholiast on Aphthonius (ii 8, Walz): *ῥητορικὴ εἴρηται ἦτοι ἀπὸ τοῦ ῥυθμὸν [ῥύθμην] λέγειν, ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ συνηγορεῖν τῷ νόμῳ· ῥήτρην γὰρ τὸν νόμον φασὶν οἱ Δωριεῖς*. This is carefully translated into French without even a passing note of exclamation, and without a syllable of protest against the scholiast's astounding ignorance of the obvious formation of so simple a word. Again, Hermogenes (*περὶ στάσεων*, ii 138, Spengel) defines *στοχασμός* as *ἀδήλου πράγματος ἔλεγχος οὐσιώδης ἀπὸ τινος φανεροῦ σημείου ἢ ἀπὸ τῆς περὶ τὸ πρόσωπον ὑποψίας*. But M. Causeret, in quoting this passage on p. 66, accidentally omits *οὐσιώδης*, which is expressly explained in the *scholia* (iv 210, 7, Walz), and wrongly translates *πρόσωπον* 'physiognomy' instead of 'person,'—a sense in which it is repeatedly used in the preceding pages of Hermogenes, e.g. on the previous page, *διαιρήσει τοίνυν ὀρθῶς ὁ τὴν τε διαφορὰν καὶ τὴν δύναμιν τῶν τε προσώπων καὶ τῶν πραγμάτων καὶ ἔτι τὴν λεγομένην στάσιν ἐπιγνοὺς τοῦ ζητήματος* (cf. iv 211, 22 Walz). In connexion with *στάσεις*, M. Causeret might have noticed Aristotle's *ἀμφισβητήσεις* (Cope's *Introduction to the Rhetoric*, pp. 397—400).

The Greek equivalents for Latin technical terms are usually given with correctness; but, in quoting *παράιτησις* and *κάθαρσις* as equivalents for the rhetorical figures *depre-*

catio and *purgatio*, it ought to be clearly explained that these terms are not really found in the Greek rhetoricians themselves as actual names of 'figures' (note on *Orator*, p. 147). As the Greek for *exercitatio*, it is better to accept *γυμνασία* from Aristotle than *γύμνασις* from Pollux; but *μελέτη*, as M. Causeret is aware, is in some respects better than either. As an equivalent for *eloquentia*, *λογιότης*, which is found in Philo and Plutarch, should give way to some such phrase as *ἡ ἐν τοῖς λόγοις δεινότης*, which has better authority. *Oratio commentata* is rendered, on p. 46, not only by *λόγος μεμελετημένος*, which is right; but also by *περιεσκεμμένος*, which ought to be altered either into *προϋσκεμμένος* on the analogy of Thuc. viii 66, *τὰ ῥηθησόμενα αὐτοῖς προϋσκεπτο*, or into *ἐσκεμμένος καὶ παρεσκευασμένος* (cf. Dem. *Meid.* § 191). On pp. 17, 56, where *ὑπόθεσις* is explained 'quod est ὑπὸ τὴν θέσιν,' there is no point in the use of the accusative for the dative. In contrast to *ὑπόθεσις*, or *quaestio finita*, the regular word, as M. Causeret is careful to show, is *θέσις*, or *quaestio infinita*; and among the many instances of this contrast are Cic. *Top.* 21 § 79 and Quint. iii 5 §§ 5—7. These references are quoted in the latest edition of Liddell and Scott, s.v. *θέσις*, V 2, where however *ἄρσις* is wrongly written for *ὑπόθεσις*. As an equivalent to *verba coagmentata* on p. 126, M. Causeret gives *εὐπαγῇ*, referring to Demetrius *περὶ ἐρμηνείας* (iii 300, Spengel); but *εὐπαγὲς* is there used not in the required sense of 'nicely adjusted in connexion with

one another,' but of a single word that has a proper euphony in itself, being in the mean between *λείον* and *τραχύ*. The true equivalent is *συνηρμοσμένα*, cf. Dion. Hal., *de comp. verb.* 23, *τὰ ὀνόματα τοῖς ὀνόμασιν ἐπιτηδείως συνηρμοσθαι*. The same author might have supplied parallels to Cicero's *conglutinatio verborum* (note on *Orator*, § 78). On p. 143, *circumscriptus* as an epithet of a period is not quite satisfactorily rendered by *συνεστραμμένος*. It might be better perhaps to resort to a phrase combined with *περιγραφή* in the sense found in Lucian's *Demosthenis Encomium* 32, *τῷ τούτου κρότῳ καὶ τόνῳ καὶ λέξεων περιγραφαῖς καὶ συνεχείαις ἀποδείξεων*. On p. 155, the reference for *ἀδρός*, *ἰσχνός* and *μέσος*, as epithets of style, should be to p. 72 (not 71) of Johannes Siceliotes. On p. 128 the accent of *ρόμος* is misplaced, and on p. 184 *ἐξουθενισμός* is twice misprinted as *ἐξουδενισμός*. Lastly, on p. 193, the rhetorical term *κλίμαξ*, which is a much more elaborate figure of speech than might be supposed from the modern application of the word, is too curtly dismissed (note on *Orator*, p. 139). Possibly, while hastening toward the close of his task, the author may have found himself compelled to forego the temptation of lingering any longer over his labours, feeling, like the poet of the *Georgics*, that, instead of embarking afresh on an inviting theme, it was already high time for him

To furl the sail, and turn the prow to land.

J. E. SANDYS.

THE VIENNA CORPUS SCRIPTORUM ECCLESIASTICORUM LATINORUM.

II.

Eugippii *Vita S. Severini*, ed. Pius Knoell, Vienna, 1886. 24 Mk. 40.

THE interest of the *Vita S. Severini* is of an altogether different kind from that of the *Excerpts from S. Augustine*, and to most readers will be far higher in degree. It gives a glimpse such as is not obtained anywhere else of the state of the border provinces on the break up of the Roman Empire. Severinus spent the greater part of his active life (452—482 A.D.) in the province of Noricum Ripense. He was regarded as a sort of oracle not only by his own countrymen but by the surrounding barbarians; and among those who came to consult him

was the young Odoacer just before his descent into Italy. His tall form, clad in rough sheep-skins, had to stoop in entering the saint's cell, and he was greeted with a prophecy of his coming greatness. We see the unfortunate provincials so entirely deserted that there are scarcely troops enough among them to pursue a band of marauding banditti. They are obliged to admit the barbarians into their cities. Rugians, Heruli, Goths, Alamanni are constantly making forays into their territory, or pass through it unceremoniously, as if it were their own. The Romans fly from city to city in search of peace, but in vain. At last, in 488, a command comes from Odoacer that the population should migrate bodily into Italy, and in accordance with the wishes

of the dying saint his body is taken with them. Not long afterwards, in the papacy of Gelasius, 492—496, a sumptuous mausoleum was built for it by a wealthy lady at Castellum Lucullanum near Naples. A monastery was also founded over which first Marcianus and then Eugippius, disciples of the saint, presided. Eugippius had been for some years in the company of Severinus on the Danube, and in the year 511 he wrote, partly from his own recollections and partly from the report of his elders, a short memoir (*Commemoratorium*) of his master. He hoped that his friend Pascasius would throw this into a more literary shape, but Pascasius declined to do this, as an unnecessary task only suggested by the modesty of Eugippius. The letters of Eugippius and Pascasius have come down to us with the memoir as it left the hands of Eugippius; and these have now been edited by Knoell, who also prints from a Vatican MS. a hymn in praise of Severinus, first published by Ozanam.

The *Vita S. Severini* is one of several instances in which the two great series, the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* and the *Corpus Scrip. Eccles. Lat.*, cross each other. The first really critical edition of this work was published in the former series by Sauppe in 1877, and the corresponding volume in the Vienna series came out last year. It is natural to compare these two editions. Certainly a great advance was marked by Sauppe, who, if he had done nothing else, at least cleared away a number of useless MSS. and brought out the value of those on which his text was constructed. Knoell has succeeded in discovering several more primary MSS. in Italian libraries; he has collated these, and on the strength of data supplied by them he has largely altered Sauppe's text.

The MSS. now available are these:

- C* = Cod. Casinensis, saec. xi.—xii.
- G* = Cod. Vaticanus alter, saec. xi.—xii.
- L* = Cod. Lateranensis, saec. x.
- M* = Cod. Ambrosianus, saec. xii.
- N* = Cod. Vallicellianus, saec. xi.—xii.
- T* = Cod. Taurinensis, saec. x.
- V* = Cod. Vaticanus prior, saec. xi.

Knoell has also occasionally used three other MSS. from Monte Cassino, which are closely allied to *CGL*. He discussed at length the whole question of the relation of

the MSS. of the *Vita* to each other in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Vienna Academy for 1880. He pointed out that they fell into two main groups, *CGL* and *Codd. Casin.* on the one hand, and *TVMN* on the other, which might be described as practically South Italian and North Italian. Several of the MSS. of the first group come from Monte Cassino, while the chief representatives of the second group, *T* and *V*, can be traced to the library of Bobbio. Sauppe based his text mainly upon *L*; Knoell gives the preference to *T*, which he was the first to bring to light.

Now I am quite ready to admit that Knoell in his turn marks an advance upon Sauppe. He has done good service by the collation—in part his own, in part carried out for him by others—of *CGNT*. The criticisms that I was led to make on the collation of the MSS. of the *Excerpts* are not applicable here. The *Vita S. Severini* was in a more manageable compass, and the collation of the MSS. is in this case all that could be desired. The existence of Sauppe's edition naturally led to the careful verification of all readings which had been noted differently, and I have little doubt that Knoell's apparatus may be trusted absolutely. But this is not all. He has set forth at length the principles which he has followed in framing his text, and, if he differs from Sauppe, gives his reasons for so doing. Up to a certain point I am quite prepared to go with him. I think he has proved that *L* is not fitted to supply the groundwork of a text. He has proved that there are many cases in which *L* has not preserved the original reading of its group. I incline to agree with him that when *G* (called *V*² in the *Sitzungsberichte*) goes over to *TV* its readings are preferable. I am ready to admit that there are readings in which the group *TV*, &c., is superior to *CGL*, but I do not think that this is so in all cases. I feel that it is hazardous to take a different view from one who has devoted to the subject years of study, but I confess that it seems to me that when the reading of the archetype of *CGL* can be clearly ascertained, and still more where this group is joined by a leading member of the other group, it deserves the preference.

I will give one or two examples in which I have little doubt that Knoell's text is wrong: and, first, some examples in which he seems to me to have either overlooked or not given due weight to the parallels which show which reading is most in keeping with the style of Eugippius:—

KNOELL.

- p. 23, 6, hunc coniux, nomine Giso, semper a clementiae remediis reuocabat.
- p. 26, 21, alioquin ab [*om. CGL*] imminenti periculo non cauebis.
This reading has apparently been influenced by *caue*, running in the mind of the scribe from two lines above.
- 42, 5, aliis ergo de tanto nuntio dubitantibus.
- 42, 17, Heruli irruentes oppidumque uexantes plurimos duxere captivos.

In most of these instances there can, I think, be little doubt that the more marked and characteristic expression is found in *CGL*, and it seems to me distinctly more probable that this has been obscured by

KNOELL'S TEXT.

- p. 18, 14, ipse uero ad secretum habitaculum saepius secedebat, ut hominum declinata frequentia oratione continua deo proprius inhaereret.
proprius (comparative of *proprie*) is a conjecture of Hartel's.
- 26, 13, ne is qui parentes reliquit et saeculum pompae saecularis inlecebras retrorsum aspiciendo euperet.
- 31, 4, flammam concussis ex more lapidibus elicere nequiverunt.
- 31, 5, in tantum alterutra hac petrae conlisione tardantes.
- 51, 10, asserens uniuersos in(de) Romanos ad suas prouincias absque ullo libertatis migraturos incommodo.
Knoell reads 'inde' by conjecture and in the rest follows *M* and *NTV* nearly.
- 64, 13, Sancti itaque corpusculum ad castellum nomine Felethem, † Mulse mensis regionis apportatum est.

In the text of the other examples it seems to me that Knoell has shown a misplaced ingenuity of suspicion which resorts to far-fetched explanations for that which is plain enough as it stands. I should certainly take no credit to myself for defending such obvious readings, but it is a perversion of scholarship to suppose that what is obvious is always

reuocabat *MNTV*: retrahebat *CGL*; cf. p. 18, 3, ciues tantum ab opere dei nec prospera nec aduersa retraherent.

cauebis *MNTV*: carebis *CGL*; cf. p. 21, 4. Incredibili ossuum dolore contritus omni caruerat incolumitate membrorum; p. 66, 5, statim caruit omnium langore membrorum.

nuntio *NTV*; nuncio *M*: praesagio *CGL*; cf. p. 51, 14, memor illius praesagii quo eum quondam expresserat regnaturum; p. 63, 2. Fredericus autem immemor contestationis et praesagii sancti uiri.

uexantes *MNTV*: uastantes *CGL*; cf. p. 50, 18, hunc populum non patiar saeua depraedatione uastari, uel gladio trucidari aut in seruitutem redigi.

paraphrase than that there has been an assimilation of the expression in one passage to that of another.

Of a somewhat different kind are the following:—

propius *CGM*: propitius *NTV*: propitio, *L*, Sauppe. I cannot see any good reason for not accepting propius: 'further from men, nearer to and more intent upon God' seems to me to be an easy and natural antithesis.

aspiciendo *MNTV*: respiciendo *CGL*. Knoell (Praef. p. xi.) compares Sedulius, 'Nemo retrorsum. . . . aspiciens soluendus erit.' But there is equally good authority for 'respiciendo.' Cf. Luke ix. 62, Lat-Vet. *codd. a b f*.

concussis *CG L²* concussit *L*: excussis *MNTV*. Knoell retracts the reading 'concussis' (Praef. p. x.) in favour of 'excussis' on the strength of a line in Ovid—'ut excussis elisi nubibus ignes'—failing to see that an expression which is applicable to a cloud is not applicable to a stone.

haec petrae *MN*: ac petre *T*: ac petre *V*: ferri ac petre *CGL*.

I do not think that 'ferri ac petrae' is a conjectural emendation but the original reading, partly retained in *TV*; the dropping out of a word is an extremely simple and common form of corruption.

Asserens uniuersos in Romani soli prouinciam absque ullo, &c., *CG* and *L* practically.

The expression 'in Romani soli prouinciam' is slightly peculiar but I think quite tenable, and it expresses Eugippius's meaning.

Mulsemensis regionis *NTV* ('sub mulse mensis regionis nomen regionis Italiae latere uidetur,' Knoell): multis emensis regionibus *CGL*.

I see no reason why this perfectly simple, easy and natural reading should be rejected.

wrong. It is to me surprising that with all his experience of MSS. Knoell should not see how slight and in accordance with all analogy is the corruption involved. The reason is that he has contracted a prejudice against the readings of *CGL* which I fully believe to be mistaken, though he himself gives (p. x.) a list of by no means unimport-

ant readings which he has taken from that group as against his favourites *MNTV*. The number of these readings in which *CGL* have preserved the true text might, I am sure, be largely increased.

The question which affects the largest section of the text is that as to the genuineness of eighteen lines in the last chapter describing two miracles of healing wrought by the body of the saint on its entrance into Naples—neither of them of such a kind that they might not have been believed by a contemporary. The relation of these two miracles is contained in *CGL* and is wanting in *MNTV*. There are also corresponding variants in the *Capitula*: the verses in honour of Severinus imply the narrative: at the same time, as the MS. in which these are found is of the eleventh century, their evidence does not in strictness go back beyond that date, though it is probable that they were written much earlier. They clearly belong to a time when the fame of the saint was at its height.

Knoell argues elaborately against the genuineness of this section (*Sitzungsberichte*, p. 486 ff.); but here again I confess that his arguments seem to me anything but happy. He quotes a number of expressions from them which he thinks are imitations from the surrounding context: to me they seem to be not imitations, but coincidences of style which point to identity of authorship. Of the two hypotheses, in the case of naïve workmanship of this kind, I cannot but regard the latter as the more probable. And the other arguments which Knoell has advanced are of little weight.

I have found myself expressing so much dissent both from Knoell and from Hartel, whose conjectures are frequently mentioned and in several cases received, that I think it only right in conclusion to quote two examples in which they seem to me to have deserved the thanks of all scholars. There is a difficult passage, p. 28, 10, where the

MSS. have *tunc ergo qui eos* (sc. *cereos*) *posuerant divino declarati examine, protinus exclamantes secreta pectoris satisfactionibus prodiderunt et suorum testimonio cereorum manifesta confessione convicti propria sacrilegia testabantur*. For *satisfactionibus* Hartel proposes *satactionibus* in the sense of 'agitation.' In the *Corrigenda* Knoell would substitute for this *satisfactionibus* which would certainly involve a minimum of change, as the *f* might easily come in through the doubling of long *s* in a half-uncial hand. Is it just possible that *satisfactionibus* might = 'making amends for their faults'?¹ The other passage is one in which it seems to me that Knoell has both skilfully and successfully defended the reading of the MSS. In p. 41, 17, the MSS. read *quas* (sc. *reliquias*) . . . *suscipiens basilicam sancti Iohannis . . . ultronea benedictione collata sacrauit officio sacerdotum*. Knoell explains this quite satisfactorily by observing that *officio* is dative not ablative, and that *benedictio* = 'relics': 'he consecrated the basilica of St. John for priestly ministration (i.e. the celebration of the mass) by placing there the relics which offered themselves to his hand.' By a sudden inspiration Severinus had called for a boat, and crossing the Danube found on the bank a man who was bringing to him some relics of St. John the Baptist—the very thing that he wanted.

W. SANDAY.

I learn through the kindness of M. Delisle that the missing portions of the interesting Desnoyers MS. of the *Excerpts* of Eugippius (Cod. D, saec. viii., see *Classical Review*, no. 5, p. 141) are in the possession of the Earl of Ashburnham. M. Delisle ascertained this too late for the knowledge to be of use to the editor of the *Excerpts*.—W. S.

¹ I owe to a friend the following parallels from Cyprian: 'Deum movere satisfactionibus' (*De Lapsis*, c. 36; ed. Hartel, p. 263, 27), 'Satisfactionibus inmorantes et Domini misericordiam deprecantes' (*Ep.* lxx. 4; p. 725, 13).

AN APPEAL IN BEHALF OF THE ARCHIV FÜR LATEINISCHE LEXICOGRAPHIE.

THE following facts need only, I am sure, to be put before the English-speaking public, in order to set this undertaking on a sound financial basis.

Professor Wölfflin of Munich, the director, has not only received no remunera-

tion, but is two thousand marks out of pocket. The Munich Academy allows £25 a year towards the expenses, but that is handed over to Mr. Teubner, the publisher. Two hundred and fifty free copies are sent to the contributors, and only 280 copies are

sold. Surely England alone ought to take at least that number.

Three volumes are now complete, and cost 12s. each. Of volume iv two parts have appeared, and a double number will this year complete the volume.

It rests with the republic of scholars to determine whether, now that the staff of workers has been collected and drilled, specimen articles published and criticised, a zealous and capable editor and public-spirited publisher found, the projected Thesaurus of Latin shall be abandoned, or whether substantial aid shall be given at once, in order to ensure its success.

To every reader I venture to say:

Buy the book yourself, and see that any library which you can influence, does the same.

Let philological societies make a substantial grant in aid. When editor and publisher have been encouraged by a steady increase of subscriptions, let them issue a prospectus and specimen of the Thesaurus itself. There can be no doubt that England will call for as many copies as any other country.

I cannot think that scholars who have not yet seen the *Archiv* know what they lose by their neglect. Many hundreds of words are there for the first time registered, and the whole method of lexicography is criticised from many points of view, so that an eye, trained by travel through these 3½ volumes, will ever afterwards search the field of Latinity with a clearer vision and a more definite aim.

JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

Les Cavaliers Athéniens. Par M. ALBERT MARTIN.
Paris. E. Thorin. 1886. 18 fr.

It may sound rather surprising at first to hear that it is possible to write a large octavo volume of 563 pages on the ἵππεῖς at Athens. But M. Martin, as he explains in the preface, takes a wide view of his subject: 'L'Histoire des Cavaliers athéniens c'est l'histoire religieuse, militaire, politique, économique et littéraire de l'ancienne Athènes . . . envisagée d'un point de vue particulier qui permet d'en saisir mieux les grandes lignes; . . . en étudiant cette histoire particulière, on voit l'histoire générale sous un jour un peu nouveau; il est donc possible d'apercevoir parfois des détails qui n'avaient pas encore été remarqués et d'apporter sur quelques points des explications nouvelles.' M. Martin has executed this difficult programme with great ability and freshness. Undoubtedly the book has defects; there are mis-translations that engender distrust in the accuracy of the author's scholarship, there are rash conjectures, there are elaborate theories built on nothing better than an ambiguous allusion. On the other hand, M. Martin has studied carefully the material provided by inscriptions, he has worked with wonderful diligence through a mass of literature and finally collected the fruits of his labour in a very readable book. For M. Martin has a respect for literary form which is not always felt by learned men: he writes clearly and with spirit, and sometimes, as when inspired by enthusiasm for 'l'aimable figure du fils d'Exékéstide' or 'ces beaux athlètes nus,' with unusual eloquence.

M. Martin treats his subject in four books. He begins with the aristocracies which are already in the Homeric poems encroaching on the king and maintaining, against Grote and Schoemann, that 'in the majority of Greek countries' the military strength of these aristocracies probably consisted of a force of chariots. The course of military development was interrupted in European Greece by the Dorian invasion which proved the superiority of heavy infantry. Only a few states were in a position to develop a cavalry numerous enough to contend against the new

tactics—hence the admitted insignificance of cavalry in many Greek states when history begins to dawn.

Passing to Attica in particular, he touches on the controversy as to the character of the four old Attic tribes without venturing an opinion except so far as to observe very justly that it seems improbable that the Ὀπλητῆς were a governing equestrian aristocracy. An organised force of Athenian cavalry cannot be traced before the time of the Solonian constitution, some aspects of which M. Martin proceeds to discuss, devoting to the legislator, for whom he has an ardent admiration, nine chapters and nearly a hundred pages. Of course the mutilated fragment of Aristotle's Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία (Landwehr, *Paragr. Berol.* No. 163. *Fr.* I. b.) comes under consideration: M. Martin inclines to subscribe to the opinion of Blass that the archon Damasias mentioned in it is to be referred to 683 B.C.: he is the *last decennial archon*, and is succeeded by *nine annual archons*, four chosen from the εὐπατρίδαι, three from the ἄποικοι, two from the δημιουργοί, but some time before Solon the εὐπατρίδαι managed to reconquer sole power. I think this the most cumbrous of the rival hypotheses. In the review of the work of Solon what M. Martin is particularly eager to bring to light is that one great object of the division into classes was the organisation of military defence. 'Deux services importants, celui de la flotte et celui de la cavalerie, sont organisés par le moyen de deux prestations, la triérarchie et l'hippotrophie, qui sont réparties entre les citoyens, d'après une division du territoire, les naucraries, et une division des personnes, les classes censitaires' p. 295. To put it in another way, he contends, following Gilbert, that Solon was also the author of the division of each of the four tribes into three *τριτῦες* and twelve *ραυκαπῆλαι*, and since Pollux (viii. 108) says that each *ραυκαπῆλα* provided two horsemen and one ship, there is given a fleet of forty-eight ships, considerable for that time, and ninety-six horsemen, which is a respectable force. The trierarchy would fall on the πεντακοσιομέδιμμοι, the class of ἵππεῖς would be liable for service in the cavalry. Here M. Martin has greatly exaggerated the value of his evidence. He confidently pronounces that Aristotle

attributed to Solon the institution of *τριττύες* and *ναυκραρίαι*. What is the proof? First this extract from Photius: *ναυκραρία μὲν ὁποῖόν τι ἡ συμμορία καὶ ὁ δῆμος, ναύκραρος δὲ ὁποῖόν τι ὁ δήμαρχος, Σόλωνος οὕτως ὀνομάσαντος ὥς καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης φησὶ καὶ ἐν τοῖς νόμοις δὲ (ἐστὶν ὁ λέγει. Rose) 'ἐάν τις ναυκραρίας ἀμφισβητῇ' καὶ 'τοὺς ναυκράρους τοὺς κατὰ τὴν ναυκραρίαν.'* I believe the words *Σόλωνος οὕτως ὀνομάσαντος* are a lexicographical reference, 'Solon having used the expression' i.e. in his Laws. M. Martin prefers to interpret 'Solon having given the name,' and concludes 'Solon then according to Aristotle created the *ναυκραρίαι*.' So much for the first passage: the second is Schol. Ar. *Nub.* 37, 'Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ περὶ Κλεισθένης φησὶ· 'κατέστησε καὶ δημάρχους τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχοντας ἐπιμέλειαν τοῖς πρότερον ναυκράροις· καὶ γὰρ τοὺς δῆμους ἀντὶ τῶν ναυκραρίων ἐποίησεν.' οἱ πρότερον ναύκραροι· εἴτε ὑπὸ Σόλωνος κατασταθέντες εἴτε καὶ πρότερον.' I see no evidence to prove that the Scholiast's note *οἱ πρότερον ναύκραροι κ.τ.λ.* contains an allusion to the opinion of Aristotle in particular. But the citation to which M. Martin trusts most is drawn again from the article of Photius on *ναυκραρία*: ἐκ τῆς Ἀριστοτέλους πολιτείας ὃν τρόπον διέταξε τὴν πόλιν ὁ Σόλων· 'φυλαὶ δὲ ἦσαν τέσσαρες καθάπερ πρότερον καὶ φυλοβασιλεῖς τέσσαρες· ἐκ δὲ τῆς φυλῆς ἐκάστης ἦσαν νενενημένοι τριττύες μὲν τρεῖς ναυκραρίαι δὲ δώδεκα καθ' ἐκάστην.' M. Martin translates 'Il y eut quatre tribus comme autrefois et quatre rois de tribus; mais, de chaque tribu, on forma trois trittyes et douze naucraries,' and concludes (p. 90):—'La phrase d'Aristote ne peut signifier qu'une chose: Solon conserve les quatre tribus avec leurs rois; il crée les trittyes et les naucraries.' This I deny: without discussing the '*mais*,' it is enough to point out that '*on forma*' is not a precise translation of *ἦσαν νενενημένοι*. All that can be safely inferred from this detached fragment is that in Aristotle's opinion *ναυκραρίαι* formed part of the constitution as reorganised by Solon, not that they were a new element introduced by him. M. Martin however goes farther, and sees in this passage an *intentional* correction of Herodotus, who mentions *ναύκραροι* before Solon, in connexion with the attempt of Cylon (v. 71. *οἱ πρυτάνεις τῶν ναυκράρων οἵπερ ἔνεμον τότε τὰς Ἀθήνας*), and not only sees this here but again in the fragment relating to Cleisthenes which has been quoted above (*κατέστησε δὲ καὶ δημάρχους κ.τ.λ.*); 'Aristote, à deux reprises, contredisait formellement Hérodote et attribuait à Solon l'institution des naucraries' p. 92. How strange after this to find the same man hesitating to pronounce that the remark made by Thucydides in narrating this attempt of Cylon (I. 126. *τότε δὲ τὰ πολλὰ τῶν πολιτικῶν οἱ ἐννέα ἄρχοντες ἐπρασσον*) is aimed against Herodotus.

After the examination of the legislative work of Solon M. Martin attempts to determine with some precision when the Athenian cavalry was raised from 100, which he puts as its number after Cleisthenes' reforms, to 1,000, the number we meet at the beginning of the Peloponnesian war. The following analysis will show the uncertainty of the calculations. At the time of the battle of Tanagra (457) the Athenian cavalry could not have numbered a thousand, for (1) in that case there would not have been in the army so large a contingent of Thessalian horse, (2) the defection of these Thessalians in the fight would not have produced such serious consequences, (3) only two horsemen fell on the Athenian side. (The evidence for this statement is Paus. I. 29. 6 *ἔστι δὲ . . . στήλη μαχομένους ἔχουσα ἵππεις· Μελάνωπός σφισιν ἔστι καὶ Μακάρτατος ὀνόματα*—they fell at Tanagra. M. Martin comments p. 128.

n. 4. 'On avait l'habitude de graver sur la même stèle les noms de ceux qui avaient été tués dans le même combat ou la même expedition.' Now M. Martin himself naturally declines to put such an interpretation on the evidence of a monument which gives only one horseman as killed at Coronea (394): *that* is the monument of a single tribe only. The monument mentioned by Pausanias may also have belonged to a single tribe or may have been erected in honour of distinguished valour). Again at the time of the battle of Coronea (447) the Athenian cavalry could not have numbered a thousand, for apparently there was no cavalry in Tolmides' army. (This is a very odd argument; there was not a large force of cavalry to take because Tolmides apparently took none. But Plutarch (*Vit. Per.* c. 18) represents Pericles as criticising just this, the irregularity and rashness of Tolmides' expedition). So much for the *terminus post quem*; the *terminus ante quem* is given by the frieze of the Parthenon which was opened in 438/7. 'Jamais on n'aurait pensé à accorder un tel rôle à la cavalerie si ce corps n'avait eu encore qu'un effectif de cent hommes' p. 131. Further in 438 this cavalry of a thousand must already have figured in a Panathenaic procession, i.e. at the previous celebration, in 442. Now the years 447—445 were years of disaster for Athens. Probably then Pericles, taught by experience the need of a stronger force, reorganised the cavalry between 445 and 442. Finally 'dans la manière dont Phidias a interprété cette *πομπή* sur la frise de la *cella*, nous verrions une preuve, un souvenir de l'impression profonde que produisit sur le peuple ce magnifique spectacle quand, pour la première fois, ce corps d'élite, composé de ce qu'Athènes avait de plus brillante jeunesse, partit, en rangs nombreux, du Céramique pour se rendre à l'Acropole,' p. 134.

The second book deals with the part played by this corps of *ἵππεις* in the religious festivals of Athens, particularly the Thesea and Panathenaea. Here there is much that is excellent, a brilliant and sympathetic description of the Hellenic festival with the procession, the sacrifice, and the *ἀγῶνες*, a clear summary of the development of '*l'agonistique*' in Greece and Athens, a minute exposition of the differences between the various contests of the *ἀγῶν ἵππικός*. M. Martin carefully examines a set of inscriptions discovered since the time of Krause, his chief predecessor in this department, for the Thesea C.I.A. II. 444—448, for the Panathenaea C.I.A. II. 2. 965—969. Unluckily these inscriptions are more or less mutilated and all (with the exception of C.I.A. II. 2. 965—first part of fourth century) are as late as the first half of the second century, so that M. Martin's speculations as to the period at which the cavalry first officially took part in various contests are highly uncertain. But this the author candidly confesses.

It is in the third book that I find most to criticise. M. Martin discusses in this section the organisation of the corps—the obligation to serve, the *δοκιμασία*, the nature of the *κατάστασις*, the fluctuating numbers of the force, the pay, officers, equipment etc. It is a delicate task to interpret justly the sense of passing observations and disconnected allusions, and M. Martin's desire for a neat and intelligible system proves too strong for his prudence. Moreover some slips of scholarship lead to serious misconceptions. Take for instance Ps.-Demosth. c. *Phaenipp.* 24: *ἵπποτρόφος ἀγαθός ἐστι καὶ φιλότιμος ἅτε νέος καὶ πλούσιος καὶ ἰσχυρὸς ὢν. τί τούτου μέγα σημεῖον; ἀποδόμενος τὸν πολεμιστήριον ἵππον καταβέβηκεν ἀπὸ τῶν ἵππων καὶ ἀντ' ἐκείνου ὕχημα αὐτῷ τηλικούτος ὢν ἐώνηται κ.τ.λ.* M. Martin has, 'En est-il une meilleure preuve? Il a vendu son cheval de guerre,

il est sorti du corps des cavaliers etc.' Surely the words can only mean 'He has come down from horseback, (has given up riding) and has effeminately taken to a carriage.' And on page 304 all M. Martin's inferences are overthrown by the simple observation that in Lysias V. 43 he has neglected ἀλλὰ μὴν and taken οὐδὲ as 'not even' when it is 'neither.' The way in which the author has occasionally done violence to common sense may be best illustrated by considering the evidence for the following statement at the end of the chapter on the method of recruiting the cavalry. 'Le citoyen riche qui n'est pas valide est tenu, puisqu'il ne peut pas contribuer de sa personne, de contribuer de ses biens, λητουργεῖ χρήμασι; il arme, il monte à ses frais des citoyens pauvres qui combattront à sa place: enfin on peut encore avoir recours à lui pour les diverses dépenses qu'exige le service de la cavalerie.' The proof may be reduced to a single passage in Xenophon, *Hipparch.* ix. 5. Xenophon has suggested that it might be a good thing to establish a force of 200 mercenary horsemen. He finishes thus: εἰς δὲ τιμὴν τῶν ἵππων νομίζω ἂν αὐτοῖς χρήματα ὑπάρξαι καὶ παρὰ τῶν σφόδρα ἀπεχομένων μὴ ἱππεύειν, ὅτι καὶ οἷς καθίστησι τὸ ἱππικὸν ἐθέλουσι τελεῖν ἀργύριον ὥς μὴ ἱππεύειν, παρὰ πλουσίων γε, ἀδυνάτων δὲ τοῖς σώμασι, οἴομαι δὲ καὶ παρ' ὀρφανῶν τῶν δυνατοῦς οἴκους ἐχόντων. The clause from ὅτι καὶ τοῖς ἱππεύειν has provoked much conjecture: M. Martin expels καθίστησι τὸ ἱππικὸν 'as a gloss' and supposes that the abbreviations of ὅτι and εἰσὶ were confused. The whole passage as reconstructed runs thus: εἰς δὲ τιμὴν τῶν ἵππων νομίζω ἂν αὐτοῖς χρήματα ὑπάρξαι καὶ παρὰ τῶν σφόδρα ἀπεχομένων μὴ ἱππεύειν, εἰσὶ (sic) καὶ οἱ (sic) ἐθέλουσι τελεῖν ἀργύριον ὥς μὴ ἱππεύειν, καὶ παρὰ πλουσίων μὲν γε, ἀδυνάτων δὲ τοῖς σώμασι, οἴομαι δὲ καὶ παρ' ὀρφανῶν τῶν δυνατοῦς οἴκους ἐχόντων. Now let all these changes be granted and still it is not legitimate to infer from Xenophon's proposal that it was customary (p. 319) at the time, much less obligatory for the rich citizen to provide a substitute if physically unable to serve on horseback. But M. Martin also detects in the passage an allusion to the κατάστασις mentioned in Lysias XVI. 6 and in Harpocration. I think the passage may be turned against his explanation. According to M. Martin, the κατάστασις is analogous to the 'aes equestre' at Rome, except that at Athens the state did not present to the newly-enrolled ἱππεὺς money to buy a mount for himself (and servant p. 344), but lent it: the sum was refunded when he passed out of the corps. There is no positive testimony in support of this, and—to pass over the contradictions in which M. Martin's exposition of the theory is involved—there is much that makes against it, as for example the remarkable absence in literature of any distinction such as that between 'equites equo publico' and 'equites equo privato'; and in the arguments against the hypothesis, I should include the passage from the *Hipparchicus*, understanding it to imply that in establishing a force of mercenary cavalry the state would have to reckon with an unusual expenditure; it would be obliged to provide horses.

The fourth and last book is entitled 'Les Cavaliers dans la Société Athénienne.' The author examines the value of the force as a military arm, and brings out very clearly the increasing importance of cavalry in warfare as the Macedonian period approaches. Drawn from the wealthier classes, these 'Knights' have in politics pronounced aristocratic sympathies, and their contests with Cleon and support of the Four Hundred and Thirty are sketched in lively prose. Not less interesting is the place they take in art and literature: 'ils sont une sorte de jeunesse dorée;

dans la ville d'Alcibiade ils appartiennent à la muse comique comme, dans la cour de Louis XIV, le petit marquis.' An attempt to estimate the policy of the 'aristocratical party' concludes a book that is very interesting if not always accurate.

W. WYSE.

Paléographie des Classiques Latins, collection de Facsimilés, publiée par ÉMILE CHATELAIN. Paris: Hachette. 1884—1887 (5 livraisons; 15 francs each.)

M. CHATELAIN's scheme for publishing a series of facsimiles of MSS. of Latin Classics was announced in 1884, and the first livraison appeared in that year. With the hopefulness which cheers on a new enterprise, the editor fixed the year 1887 as the date for the completion of his work; but, having regard to the difficulties and hindrances which must inevitably arise in such an ingathering of scattered material, we are in no way surprised to find M. Chatelain just midway, if indeed so far, on his journey. The fifth livraison has just appeared; and we feel pretty confident that ten livraisons, the number originally announced for the completion of the series, will not suffice for a proper exhaustion of the subject. Seventy-five plates, containing facsimiles of upwards of one hundred MSS., have been issued. The subjects for the greater number, in fact more than a third of the whole, have been found in the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris. The Vatican supplies about a score; and Florence, Leyden, St. Gall, Milan, Vienna, and several other continental towns have been drawn upon for the rest. No MSS. in English libraries have yet been touched. Thus it is to be feared that M. Chatelain has still a good many years' work before him ere he can cease from his labours. Meanwhile, *Vita brevis!* Posterity will in any case be happy. For ourselves, we will hope for long days; and in order to stimulate M. Chatelain's praiseworthy efforts, we would urge all classical students to subscribe, for the series, the very moderate sum which the publishers have fixed.

The authors to whom M. Chatelain has hitherto devoted his attention are Plautus, Terence, Varro, Catullus, Cicero, Caesar, Sallust, Lucretius, and Virgil. Cicero occupies two entire livraisons; Virgil one. A large proportion of the plates, as was naturally to be expected, represent MSS. of the ninth and tenth centuries, of which period so many fortunately survive. For specimens of classical MSS. of earlier date recourse must be had, with few exceptions, to the palimpsest fragments and other imperfect MSS. of more remote times. In some instances the condition of these fragments has driven the editor to repeat in his series the same specimens that have already appeared in other works. This was unavoidable. Generally however M. Chatelain gives us fresh pages, which we gratefully welcome. We would however say a word with regard to the dates which are ascribed to these early MSS. In a work like the present, in which the letter-press is restricted to narrow dimensions, one must not expect explanations of the editor's views; but it is a little startling to find M. Chatelain differing, in certain cases, very widely from opinions which have been given by other students in the same department. Professors Zange-meister and Wattenbach made a special study of most of these early classical fragments and have given their reasons for the dates which they have assigned to them in their *Exempla*. Their judgment is not lightly to be set aside. Nor are we altogether satisfied with M. Chatelain's dating of his later specimens. Many of the MSS. which he attributes to the ninth century appear rather to belong to the

tenth; some, attributed to the tenth, to belong to the eleventh; and so on, with others. In these latter instances, however, some latitude is allowable for difference of opinion; and a cautious palaeographer will be slow to lay down an *ipse dixit* on view of a facsimile alone, without sight of the MS. also. But no one will find fault with the plates. They are excellently produced by the Dujardin process, and also do credit to M. Chatelain's skill as an amateur photographer; for we understand that he makes most of the negatives himself.

Plautus, the author who opens the series, is represented by five MSS., at the head of which stand the palimpsest fragments of the Ambrosian Library, written in rustic capitals of the fourth century. Terence follows with a plate from the codex Bembinus, and, amongst others, with facsimiles from the three MSS. at Paris, Milan, and Rome, here ascribed to the ninth century, all of which are illustrated with drawings preserving the traditional classical character of the prototype. Another MS. in St. Peter's at Rome has blank spaces left for the insertion of the pictures. Of Varro there is but one early MS. extant, a Lombardic copy of the eleventh century. An interesting MS. of the end of the eighth or beginning of the ninth century, containing an extract from this author and belonging to the Bibliothèque Nationale, is here also represented. Catullus likewise is one of those authors whose full texts are only to be found in late MSS. of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The codex Thuanus of the ninth century contains only *carmen lxii*. For a complete copy of Catullus we have to descend to an Italian MS. which bears the date of 1375.

The facsimiles of the works of Cicero, as we have already said, occupy two entire livraisons, and are drawn from as many as fifty-four MSS. in many different libraries and of many periods. We note among the MSS. which appear to have escaped the attention of recent editors a copy of The Rhetorica "ad Herennium" of the ninth century at Berne (pl. xvi. 2), and another Lombardic MS. of the same work in the Laurenziana (pl. xvii. 1); the Catiline orations in a MS. at Milan, here assigned to the tenth century (pl. xxviii. 3); and the "de Senectute," of the ninth century, at Leyden (pl. xli. 1). Plate xxvi. contains a facsimile of the oration "in Pisouem" written in uncial characters of the eighth century in the MS. (Orelli's V.) in St. Peter's at Rome; and in pl. xlv. we have a page of the Tuscans from the interesting Paris MS. 6332 of the ninth century, written in stichometrical arrangement. The palimpsests are to be seen in pl. xxix., containing one of the Ambrosian fragments of orations, of which very little can now be deciphered, and one of the Turin fragments "pro Tullio," the delicate capitals of which may well be of the fourth century to which they are assigned; in pl. xxx., in which is the single leaf of the Verrine orations, at Turin, which M. Chatelain would place as early as the third century; in pl. xxxii., giving the Vatican Verres written in capitals of the third or fourth century, and an almost illegible uncial fragment of the "pro Fonteio" also in the Vatican and ascribed to the fifth century; and in pl. xxxix., which contains a leaf of the great Vatican MS. of the "de Republica" in uncials of the fourth century.

Caesar is represented by six facsimiles; Sallust by eight; Lucetius by six. In pl. li. M. Chatelain has given a copy of one side of the early fragment of Sallust in the Vatican, the date of which is set in the third century. The other side is given in Zangemeister and Wattenbach's *Exempla*.

The fifth livraison which has just appeared is

devoted to facsimiles of the MSS. of Virgil; and of the eighteen specimens which are given eight represent those ancient codices or fragments of the works of the poet so famous among the ancient relics of Latin literature. It is in his estimate of the age of certain of these specimens that M. Chatelain differs so widely from other modern opinions. In the first place he sets before us one of the four leaves of the Vatican MS. (No. 3256), written in large square capitals, as of the second or third century; in the *Exempla*, one of the three leaves of the same MS., which Pertz was so fortunate as to secure for the Berlin Library, is given with the more modest date of the end of the fourth century. The date of the fourth century assigned to the two following specimens, viz. the St. Gall fragments and the "Schedae Vaticanae," is in general agreement with the received opinion; but why M. Chatelain should place the two great rustic MSS. of the Vatican so low in the scale, the "Palatinus" in the fifth century, and the "Romanus" in the sixth century, we are at a loss to divine. The editors of the *Exempla* held another opinion, and considered them as surpassing all other MSS. in "sincerae antiquitatis specie." The sixth specimen is taken from the "Mediceus," the only one of these early codices which contains internal evidence for an approximate date. In the last plate are given facsimiles of the almost illegible palimpsest of Verona and the Paris MS. of Asper's commentary on Virgil. Among the minuscule specimens we note a facsimile of the Berne MS. of the Aeneid with its numerous scholia, some of which are written in Tironian shorthand.

In conclusion we would draw attention to the bibliographical information and to the careful references to other facsimiles of individual MSS. which M. Chatelain has printed in the letter-press.

E. MAUNDE THOMPSON.

Notes on Thucydides, Book I. By R. GEARE, B.A.,
Assistant Master King's College School. 2s. 6d.

THESE notes are intended chiefly for the upper middle forms in public schools, and are adapted to the Oxford text, both in readings and in the division of chapters. Mr. Geare has done his work well; his notes are judiciously compiled, and are as a rule clear and scholarlike. Nor are they such as to encourage laziness and supersede the use of grammar and dictionary; they do not give too much translation or translate too literally. Indeed the careless school-boy may find himself entrapped by such free renderings as ὑπὸ τοῦ γενομένου σεισμοῦ, 'by the occurrence of an earthquake' (c. 101); ὁρᾶτε ὅπως μὴ αἰσχίον καὶ ἀπορώτερον τῇ Πελοποννήσῃ πράξωμεν, 'that we do not bring greater shame and difficulties upon the Peloponnese' (c. 82). On this latter passage Mr. Geare is careful to note that the subjunctive after ὅπως μὴ violates an almost universal rule. Taking any chapters of recognised difficulty, e.g. 76 and 77, as a test, we find no superfluous annotation, and fairly sufficient help throughout. We might, however, expect a note on ἐλασσούμενοι (c. 77, init.), and on γνώμη (opposed to δύναμις), which is merely translated 'in a question of right.' Mr. Shilleto gives 'judicial sentence.' Again, οὐ προσήκει πρὸς τὰς ἀρχάς (c. 90) surely requires a note on the use of the abstract ἀρχάς, and in the same chapter the force of ὑπὸ in ὑπειπών is not adequately explained by the bare rendering, 'giving them to understand.' In his historical and geographical notes, Mr. Geare gives very useful help, and his book is also provided with a good index.—C. E. G.

PLATO AND MARCUS AURELIUS FOR ENGLISH READERS.

Socrates, a translation of the Apology, Crito, and parts of the Phædo. Sixth edition. FISHER UNWIN. 1887. 3s. 6d.

Talks with Socrates about life, from the Gorgias and Republic. FISHER UNWIN. 1887. 3s. 6d.

EVERY one must welcome these attempts to bring within the reach of the many some of the best and noblest teaching of the Ancient World. The price is low, and binding, paper and print are alike satisfactory, except that the type of the *Socrates* is rather worn. The translation, if not quite up to the standard of Prof. Jowett, is in general accurate and easy. Both volumes of Plato begin with a useful introduction by the anonymous American translator, and the first volume is further recommended by a preface written by one whose name is held in honour by all English scholars, Prof. Goodwin of Harvard University.

Marcus Aurelius. Translated by JEREMY COLLIER, revised by ALICE ZIMMERN. Camelot Series. W. SCOTT. 1887. 1s.

COMPARATIVELY little has been done for the elucidation of the language of Marcus Aurelius; and it is often difficult, first, to make sure that one has caught the right sense, and then to express it in words which shall be intelligible, and yet not entirely lose the abrupt short-hand manner of the original. Miss Zimmern takes the old Non-juror's translation as the basis of her own, and she succeeds in giving a rendering which, if less accurate, is at any rate more readable than Long's, as will be evident from the following versions of a passage taken at random from III. 2:—

'We ought to observe also that even the things which follow after the things which are produced according to nature contain something pleasing and attractive. For instance, when bread is baked, some parts are split at the surface, and these parts which thus open and have a certain fashion contrary to the purpose of the baker's art, are beautiful in a manner and in a peculiar way excite a desire for eating.'—LONG.

'It is worth while to observe that the least thing which happens naturally to things natural has something in itself that is pleasing and delightful. Thus for example there are cracks and little breaks on the surface of a loaf, which, though never intended by the baker, have a sort of agreeableness in them which invites the appetite.'—ZIMMERN.

Collier's style however, *i.e.* the jaunty and obtrusively familiar style affected by the fine gentleman of the close of the seventeenth century, is, if not, what Long calls it, 'a most coarse and vulgar copy of the original,' yet hardly the right medium for the solitary musings of the imperial philosopher; and Miss Zimmern has on the whole done wisely in pruning its excrescences and so bringing it nearer to the original Greek. Here and there we think she has changed for the worse. For instance, it is surely only a perverse literalness to write 'from my governor I learned not to join either the green or the blue faction on the race-ground, nor to support the Parmularius or Sentarius at the gladiators' shows,' instead of Collier's 'I learned not to overvalue the diversions of the race-ground and amphitheatre, nor to dote upon the liveries and distinctions of jockeys and gladiators.' To the ordinary English reader the latter version really represents the thought of the writer more exactly than the former, because there is nothing here of pedantry or antiquarianism in the language of Aurelius. And why omit the very

characteristic οὔτε τραγῳδός, οὔτε πόρνη ('neither rant nor wheedle') of V. 28?¹

But the chief shortcomings of the new translation arise from a too close following of the old. Thus in I 15 εὐθυμία is rightly translated 'cheerfulness' in L., but 'to be full of spirits' in C. and Z.; in I 16 ἀτραγῳδῶς ('without display' L.) is 'without hurry or being embarrassed' C. and Z.; II 7 παῦσαι ῥεμβόμενος ('cease to be whirled about' L.) is 'cease rambling' C. and Z.

We add some examples where C. and Z. both go wrong, but in different ways:—

III 4 ἡ γὰρ ἐκάστω νεμομένη μοῖρα συνεμφέρεται τε καὶ συνεμφέρει ('the lot assigned to each is a constituent element of the whole, partly determining it, partly determined by it') is translated 'every man's fate is suitable, since it is suited to him' Z.; III 6 ἀπόφηναι ('say so' L.) 'reject it' Z.; VII 28 εἰς σαυτὸν συνειλοῦ ('retire into thyself' L.) 'rely upon yourself' Z.

While then on the whole we should rank this first of the complete English translations of Aurelius (Prof. Crossley's excellent version is at present limited to a single book), it will be seen from the specimens we have given, that there is plenty of room for improvement in a new edition.

Platonische Studien. By H. BONITZ. 3rd ed. Berlin, Vahlen, 1886. 7 Mk.

Ueber die Unterscheidung einer doppelten Gestalt der Ideenlehre in der platonischen Schriften. By E. ZELLER. (*Sitzungsberichte der kön. preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* xii. pp. 197—220, Mar. 3, 1887.)

THE third edition of Bonitz' admirable work contains few alterations. References to recent literature have been added in the foot-notes. There is an additional paper, first read in 1878, in which the difficult passage *Phædo* 62 A is treated grammatically: τοῦτο is taken (as τοῦτο ποιεῖν in 61 B) as αὐτὸν ἑαυτὸν ἀποκτινύοναι; Wytttenbach's punctuation is adopted, viz. a comma after οἷς βέλτιον, so that the words ὥσπερ καὶ τᾶλλα ἔστιν ὅτε καὶ οἷς βέλτιον all go together; and the following sense is obtained: 'it may seem strange that suicide should be something invariable, and should not be permitted in many cases, where, namely, death is a benefit.' In the *Theætetus* one slight modification is admitted: in deference to the criticism of Kriegenbühl the section 170 A—179 C (exclusive of the digression) is no longer presented as the decisive and valid refutation, in Plato's sense, of the Protagorean maxim.

Bonitz displays the sagacity, moderation and practical good sense which English scholars especially prize. The merit of his book is the restriction of its aim—simply to understand each separate dialogue as a whole and to reproduce the author's intention in composing it. Hence the prominence given to analysis and arrangement, the questions of primary importance being the discovery of natural divisions in the dialogue, and the relations of the various subordinate parts to the whole and to each other. When all this has been settled there is still room for an occasional discussion, *c. g.* upon the scope and results of the *Sophist*, or upon the genuineness of the *Euthydemus* (against Schaarschmidt). Perhaps in such discussions it is hard to avoid going beyond the limits prescribed. The reasons given (p. 264 *sqq.*) for pronouncing certain propositions defended by Socrates in the *Protagoras* to be unplatonic, strike

¹ For construction we must supply something like δ ἀγαθός ἐστιν.

one as in curious contrast to the general tone of the exposition.

From these fruitful and suggestive studies we pass to the searching criticism which another honoured veteran has applied to Dr. Jackson's articles on the Later Theory of Ideas published during the past five years in the *Journal of Philology*. Zeller has obviously studied them carefully, though he may not in every case have caught the writer's precise intention: thus it will be found that the 'thorough-going idealism' which Jackson and Archer-Hind attribute to Plato is not fairly described as phenomenalism. Zeller meets the English scholar with uncompromising opposition. He admits that a change was made in the system towards the end of Plato's life, but he denies that there are appreciable traces of it in the later dialogues: at least, such traces as Jackson perceives. Accordingly he undertakes to prove (1) that in the five later dialogues (as Jackson assumes them to be)—*Philebus*, *Parmenides*, *Timaeus*, *Theaetetus*, *Sophist*—ideas of other than natural objects are recognised, and that these are ideas καθ' αὐτά, for he urges that neither Plato nor Aristotle knew of any other ideas, or ideas which are mere categories: (2) that the relation of particulars to ideas expressed by the term *imitation* (μίμησις) is found in the earlier dialogues and is therefore not a peculiarity of these five; and (3) that Plato had not, when he wrote the latter, abandoned the doctrine of *participation* (μέθεξις). To this main contention is joined a criticism of the view which attributes to Plato an analysis of the sensible thing into sensations in our mind; and of the interpretations which Dr. Jackson puts upon *Theaet.* 156 A sqq. and *Sophist* 246 A, 248 A sqq. Zeller repeats his well-known opinion that the doctrine of the *Sophist* is the farthest of all from that attributed by Aristotle to Plato, and argues that the close connexion of the *Sophist* with the *Theaetetus* forbids our assuming for it a date much later than 390 B. C. Taking up this conservative attitude, it is natural that he should believe the *Philebus* to be cited in the *Republic*, and should distrust the inferences drawn by Dittenberger (and later by Schanz) from the Platonic use of certain particles and phrases, as μήν, τῶ ὄντι and ὄντως, &c. His determination of the date of the *Theaetetus* is certainly ingenious. From 175 A Rohde had argued that Agesilaus was the king who traced back his line by twenty-five ancestors to Heracles. Zeller shows that Agesilaus will not suit, while Agesipolis, who reigned from 394 to 380, will. Hence he infers the battle of Corinth in which Theaetetus is wounded must be the earlier one, of 392, not the later one of 368 B. C. And he even argues from the metaphorical term πελταστικός ἀνὴρ in *Theaet.* 165 D that the use of these mercenaries was something recent and striking at the date of the dialogue.

From Dr. Jackson's side it cannot be said that these chronological difficulties are fatal. An earlier date for the *Theaetetus* is made more probable than it was lately thought to be: but it is very obvious that we have received nothing like a cogent proof that it must come as early as 390, or in fact before the *Phaedo* and *Republic*. But it is the development of Platonic doctrine which is the real turning-point of the controversy. It will be interesting to see how Dr. Jackson replies to Zeller's objections.—R. D. II.

Gaii Iulii Caesaris de bello Gallico Commentarii, after the German of Kraner-Dittenberger. By Rev. JOHN BOND, M.A., and A. S. WALPOLE, M.A. London. Macmillan. 6s.

THE editors have reproduced in substance Dittenberger's revision of Kraner's excellent school edition, and have added some fresh material from various

sources. The omission of Hirtius' supplementary eighth book, which must on no account be despised merely because it was not written by Caesar, is to be regretted, as the want of it leaves the history of the Gallic campaigns incomplete. The notes, so far as I have examined them, are clear and concise. A few points require correction. The word 'physical' in the explanation of *firmus*, i. 3, § 8, is rather misleading (the reference there given should be v. 54, § 2); nor is it quite wise to say, on i. 5, § 4, that *is* ought to be *se*, or, on v. 11, § 4, that *sunt* should be *sint*; the natural inference in an observant schoolboy's mind being either that Caesar did not write good Latin, or that the MSS. are at fault, neither of which suppositions would be correct. Misleading too is the note on i. 6, § 2, *transitur* = *transeundus est*. On v. 13, § 3, Pytheas of Marseilles is apparently distinguished from 'Greek Authors.' On vi. 20, Kraner's wrong reference (Cic. *Fam.* ix. 80) is reproduced. On vii. 1, Kraner's note, 'der geängstigte Senat ermächtigte, da es nicht zu einer Consulwahl kam, den Pompeius,' &c. (I quote from Kraner's tenth edition), is thus translated: 'As the Senate in its panic could not choose consuls, it empowered Pompey,' &c. A less important mistranslation occurs in vii. 3: 'Partly to lend out their money on interest, in places where they were not restricted by usury laws as in Rome,' for 'theils um ihr Geld auf Zinsen auszuleihen (wobei sie nicht durch Wucher-gesetze, wie zu Rom, beschränkt waren).' These mistranslations make one mistrustful of the editors' knowledge of German. In the account of the Bridge the editors are content to follow Kraner without any discussion of the difficulties of Caesar's description, or any intimation that such difficulties exist. The literature on this subject is becoming large, and I may refer the editors, if they are not already acquainted with it, to Heller's review of A. Schleusinger's 'Studie zu Cäsar's Rheinbrücke' in the *Philologischer Anzeiger*, 1884, xiv. pp. 531-548, as well as to the interesting communication from Mr. E. V. Arnold in the *Classical Review* for June. I do not understand on what principle two special plans of sites (taken from Rutherford's edition of Book II.) are given, and no others. When Kampen's maps are so cheap and accessible, why give any plans at all? or if any, why these, which are hardly the most important? In point of typographical correctness, this edition requires careful revision; the following misprints may be mentioned: in the general map, *Noridunum* on the Aisne, *Mediolanum* in Gallia Cisalpina; Introd. p. xvii. note, *dant* (without reference); Notes, p. 233, *silvis*; p. 288, *lavarent*; p. 289, *vocare*; p. 310, *cadum* (with wrong punctuation); p. 329, *augere*; p. 337, *Belon*; Geogr. Index, p. 398, *extramas*. On p. 295, 'at the end of the Notes,' should be 'at the end of the Introduction.' In the Index it is tantalising to see 'derivation of *soldurii*,' and on turning to the reference to find 'derivation unknown.' The name of M. Desjardins is spelt wrongly throughout.

It will be seen that the work needs to be thoroughly revised from beginning to end. When this is done, and I hope the editors will do it, for it is well worth doing, the new edition will be a good serviceable book, which may be confidently recommended for school use.—A. G. P.

Caesar, B. G. IV. Edited by CLEMENT BRYANS, M.A. 1s. 6d.

THIS is one of Macmillan's useful Elementary Classics edited in compact form with vocabularies for beginners.

Mr. Bryans, as a practical schoolmaster, knows by instinct the scale on which his notes should be; and this is a great point. The notes seem on the whole to be about the right length, and to touch the right points: occasional divergences from what is strictly necessary are pardonable and even welcome, as e.g. the collection of uses of *quin*, p. 41, or the more superfluous note on the gerund, p. 59.

The following may be perhaps improved in another edition. P. 32. *in vicem*, not 'for a turn,' but like *in numerum, in versum*. P. 34, 2. *co ut* cannot mean 'for this reason that': the *quo* is comparable to *non quo*. P. 40, 7. *qua spe* is better explained as 'by hope of which' like *is terror*, 'fear of that.' To say *spe* = 'hopes' is misleading. P. 41, 11. 'ought to be imperf.' is unfortunate: the usage is normal. P. 41, 3. *posse* imperf. inf. is surely wrong: it is oblique of *potest*, the imperf. *remunerent* is due to the past *respondit*. P. 44, 13. *obsessit* is suboblique simply, not 'attracted.' P. 54, 18. in *satis profectum* (like *satis factum*), the *satis* is subject.

A. S.

Ovid's Tristia. Book I. Edited by S. G. OWEN. 3s. 6d.

THIS is a thoroughly scholarly edition, to which the editor has devoted enormous pains, and no small amount of research. The value of the latter, which is chiefly conspicuous in the treatment the poet's autobiography, and in the editing of the text, it hardly falls within the province of a reviewer of schoolbooks to estimate. We may say however that the introduction is in its handling of facts complete, clear, and able: and judgment is shown in the selection of readings. The author has presented a tolerably complete picture of Ovid's life and the circle of his friends; and has made out an exceedingly good case for the conjecture that the poet's exile was due to his complicity with the intrigue between Julia and Silanus. The least satisfactory part of the introduction is the section on the literary value of the *Tristia*. The editor too much takes the tone of an advocate for his author. For example it is going too far to hold up to our admiration Ovid's expression of affection for his loving wife. Whatever the poet was, he was not a family man: and the consolation to his wife is as hollow as can be. When he tells her to imitate the empress, we see the object of the letter: and we cannot agree with the taste or the truth of the remark that the poor woman 'deserved a happier but not a better husband.' It is still worse when the editor justifies the querulous unmanliness of the *Tristia* by the remark:—

'There is as much of sorrow as of happiness in the world: and it is the function of the poet to sing of the sadder aspects of human life as well as the happier.'

and refers us in a note to *sunt lacrimae rerum et mentem mortalium tangunt*. No human being really feels that Ovid got more than he deserved: and it gives one a positive shock to find, brought into comparison together, the unspeakable line of the great poet, which has touched the very springs of feeling for centuries, and the *me miserum's* and *a! quoniam* of the shallow selfish libertine who had a gift for verses.

Apart from these faults of taste—which we have dwelt on disproportionately—the introduction is good and valuable. Our only misgiving is, that the evidence of erudition is so considerable as to be terrifying to the schoolboy: and we should have preferred to have first the complete scholar's edition of the book, where such erudition would have been in place, and then an abridged one for schools, with much fewer references. The same remark applies to

the *apparatus criticus* of the text: for the easy elegiacs of Ovid are chiefly read in those parts of a school where critical editions are superfluous.

The notes seem very thorough, and though long on the whole, are not prolix or irrelevant. A great deal might be learnt from them by any reader: though no doubt the fourth or fifth form boy (who will probably use the book) will find much that might without loss be concealed from him. It must also be said, and this is the real merit of the notes, that he will really find what he wants.

We have marked one or two details where improvement might be made, chiefly in grammatical points, where the editor is generally very careful.

i. 79. A note is quoted of Professor Nettleship's about the imperfect subjunctive of past time, in a way which suggests that it is an unusual use. One seems a survival of the once common but erroneous theory that the imperfect subj. refers normally only to present time. There is again a want of clearness in the note on i. 125, *si ferres . . . futurum eras*, which simply means 'had you been carrying . . . you would have been,' *futurus eras* being the same periphrasis for past conditional as *futurum fuisse* in *or. obl.* See also p. 70 note on 14.

i. 88. The word *restrictis* is a pity. It is only true in the sense in which all consecutives are restrictive. It is better to confine the use of the word *restrictive* consecutives to the well-marked class of which examples are *ita omisi ut leviter tangere, ita abii ut portam tamen non clauderem*.

iii. 47. Why should *præcipitata* be middle? The middle (i.e. true reflexive) use is clearly employed by Augustans; but need not be violently introduced where the common passive meaning is natural and sufficient.

But these are very small points in seventy pages of notes which are unusually accurate and complete.

A. S.

Kleine philologische Schriften von THEODOR BERGK. Herausgegeben von R. Peppmüller. II. Band. *Zur griechischen Literatur*. Halle a. S., Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses. 1886. Pp. xcv. 813. 12 mk.

THIS volume, which is a library in itself rather than a book, would require to review it the learning of another Bergk and the space of a whole magazine. All that it is possible to do is to note the contents briefly. More it is unnecessary to do, for the volume contains nothing which has not been published before. Less must not be done, because many of Bergk's minor writings on Greek literature are not included in this volume; and there is a danger lest students not knowing its contents should buy it for the sake of some dissertation which it does not contain. What has been Herr Peppmüller's principle of selection it is difficult to discover, for several of the treatises which he has republished might well have been excluded to make room for others which he has not printed and which, from his preface, there seems to be no great likelihood of his printing in collected form hereafter. Some papers have been absorbed in more solid works and therefore did not require reprinting. The *Herakleia* for instance has been absorbed in Mr. Bywater's *Herakleitos*; the *Ekatesthenia* by Hiller; the *Callimachia* in O. Schneider's edition; while Bergk's own History of Greek literature contains all that is valuable in the *Reension* von K. O. Müller's *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, the paper *Ueber das älteste Verzeichnis der Griechen*, the *Commentatio de tabula Iliaca Parisiensis*, and the treatises *Ueber die Einheit und Untheilbarkeit des ersten Buches des Ilias* and

Wann beginnt die Alexandrische Periode. Others are now antediluvian, as for instance *das Zeitalter des Babrius*, which argues that Babrius belongs to the Alexandrine period and which has been exploded by Eberhard and Crusius long ago. The review of *der Rüstow-Köchlyschen Geschichte des griechischen Kriegswesen* has no interest since the book reviewed has ceased to be read. Other reviews, however, such as that of Böckh's *Staatshaushaltung der Athener*, and of Meier's *Diäteten* (together with *die Attischen Schiedsrichter*) contain matter which still requires to be read and utilized, e.g. Bergk's lucid and plausible view of the Naucreries. In the paper *Ueber den Amtseid der Attischen Archonten* we have Poll. viii. 86, ὡμνον δ' οὗτοι πρὸς τῇ βασιλείᾳ στοᾷ ἐπὶ τοῦ λίθου ὑφ' ᾧ τὰ ταμεία, συμφυλάξουσιν τοὺς νόμους emended into ἐφ' οὗ τὰ τόμια σὺς, φυλάξουσιν. And the ἀνδρίας χρυσοῦς ἰσομέτρητος which was the fine inflicted on an archon for receiving a bribe is explained by Bergk to mean a figure of gold weighing as much as did the silver with which the archon was bribed. The reprint from the 'Rheinisches Museum' zur *Aristotelischen Politik der Athener* is known to all who are interested in the reforms of Solon. The *Verzeichniss der Siege dramatischer Dichter in Athen* contains an attempt to reverse the common opinion that the results of the dramatic contests at Athens were recorded contemporaneously on stone. The paper *Ueber die Beschränkungen der Freiheit der ältern Komödie* ascribes the restriction of the liberty of comedy to the reactionary religious party at Athens. The most important section in the book is the *Empedoclea*, consisting of reviews of Karsten and Stein, conjectures and a commentary on the Proem—all indispensable to the student of Empedocles. Finally, there remain to be mentioned some emendations of Parmenides, the dissertation *de Aristotelis libello de Xenophane*, another *de Chrysippi libris περὶ ἀποφατικῶν*, some *Hermesianactea*, *Theocritea* and *Epicharmea*, papers on *die Aufgabe der Alterthumswissenschaft*, and *die Geburt der Athene*, and some *Miscellanea*.—F. B. JEVONS.

The First Epistle to the Corinthians, with Notes, &c.
By the Rev. J. J. LIAS. (Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools.)

THE merits and demerits of this volume are mainly negative. At least its positive merits lie beyond the horizon of a classical review. A clearly and carefully written introduction, good illustrative matter in many of the notes, and a number of well chosen references sending the student to accessible and trustworthy sources for further information, are distinct merits, and will ensure the commentary an extended use. We regret all the more that the strictly exegetical matter must be pronounced disappointing. We much doubt whether a theological student, after going through the epistle with this commentary, will have learnt much of the science of exegesis proper, of that close grappling with the idiom and thought of the Greek text which is the pith and marrow of fruitful study of the New Testament. And, while the notes embody the results of many standard authorities, we miss any reference to much of the best recent work both at home and abroad. For example, we see no trace in these notes of any use of Canon Evans' contribution to the Speaker's commentary. *Μεμέρισται δὲ Χριστός*; is discussed as though Canon Evans' note had never been written: the much disputed question of *μᾶλλον χρῆσαι* (7. 21) is decided, not, as it ought to be, on philological grounds, but by general considerations on the nature of Christian liberty and the like. Again Canon Evans' brilliant treatment of the N. T. use of *ἴνα* should, if not adopted, at least have

been noticed in the many crucial passages which this epistle contains. In the difficult verse x. 29 *ἵνα* is, apparently without misgiving, rendered 'by what right,' a meaning *ἵνα* surely cannot bear. Throughout, there is a tendency to miss points of scholarship.

More seriously objectionable is the note on vii. 34, *καὶ μεμέρισται*, where Tischendorf is misquoted with the result of misrepresenting his meaning; and Jerome is made to say the opposite of what his words really mean.

We do not then consider Mr. Lias' commentary to have contributed much to exegesis. At the same time it contains, as we have said, much useful illustrative matter, and the notes are invariably clear and concise.—A. R.

Three Anti-Pelagian Treatises of S. Augustine.

Translated with Analyses by F. H. WOODS, B.D., and J. O. JOHNSTON. D. Nutt, 1887. Pp. xxvii. 242. 4s. 6d.

THE three treatises are the *De Spiritu et Littera*, the *De Natura et Gratia*, and the *De Gestis Pelagii*. They form part of the work for the Honour School of Theology at Oxford, and the two editors are both of them Lecturers in Theology, the one at St. John's, the other at Lincoln and Merton. The text adopted is that of the Benedictine edition, deviations from which are generally noted in the margin. This is the second translation of these treatises into English during the last fifteen years. In 1872 they appeared in the translation of the works of S. Augustine then being published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark of Edinburgh. That edition of them, made by Dr. Holmes, claimed to be first rendering of them into English. One obvious advantage which the volume before us has over the other two is its convenient size; and another is that it can be bought separately, and does not involve the purchase of several other volumes. A further advantage which it has over its predecessors lies in the careful and full analyses which precede the treatises. But the editors would probably have done well if they had followed Dr. Holmes in giving *headings* both to the chapters and the pages. Such things coax the listless reader to persevere, and are a real help to the genuine student in finding quickly some topic for which he is hunting. Clearness, however, is gained in another direction by placing the references to Scripture in the margin against the quotation, instead of in a heap at the bottom of the page. But only in a single instance is attention drawn to the difference between Augustine's Latin text and the Vulgate (*prævaricationis gratia* for *propter transgressionem* in Gal. iii. 19.) Where Augustine's text allows it, Scripture is given in the words of the A. V.

The translation reads smoothly, and comparison with the original in passages taken at random shows it to be accurate.—A. PLUMMER.

De la latinité des sermons de Saint Augustin par AD. REGNIER. Paris, Hachette, 1886. Svo. pp. xviii, 212. 6 fr.

IN the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries France took the lead in Greek and Latin lexicography; witness Budé, H. and R. Estienne, Duange. Didot did much to recover the lost credit of his country, and of late Quicherat, Riemann, and Goelzer (*Étude lexicographique et grammaticale de la Latinité de Saint Jérôme*, Paris, Hachette, 1884) have entered into friendly rivalry with Georges, Wölflin, Pancker, Rönseh, and other Germans who have largely enriched our Latin lexicons during the last quarter of a century.

The author declares: 'J'ai lu et relu les textes avec grand soin, et ne crois pas avoir fait de graves omissions, au moins dans les parties qui traitent du vocabulaire; du sens et de la flexion.'

I have carefully gone through the whole book, comparing with different portions one or other of three annotated lexicons, in which, to my own collections, I have added those of Paucker and many others. I have derived from M. Regnier many additional examples, one or two new words. In general where I had already cited the same example, I have found his citation accurate, and can honestly recommend the book to all who are interested in Augustine and his age. It displays an acquaintance with the most recent researches in France and Germany, and will be welcome to Georges, Rönsch, and their fellow-workers.

I proceed to point out some shortcomings. There is no index: to make the book serviceable the reader must be content, as I have been, to transfer its contents to the margin of his lexicon.

I have not examined the references, except by comparing them with my own memoranda; but I have found some passages cited variously in different pages.

Thus (p. 10) *incantare* is not in serm. 52, but (p. 190) in 32; *multiloquium* neither in s. 26 (p. 10), nor yet in 36 (p. 166), but in 56; *propitiare* not in s. 251 (p. 10), but 351 (p. 189); *medullitus* not in § 5 (p. 10), but § 3 (p. 198) of s. 293; *corpulentia* in § 2 (p. 94), not § 1 (p. 103) of s. 214; *conscissio* in s. 56 (p. 168), not 36 (p. 178).

To Terence are ascribed *prostitutio* (p. 10), and *non sum occupatus dare operam amico* (p. 72). The former belongs to Tertullian, the latter to the Truculentus of Plautus, as Georges (whom M. Regnier nowhere cites) informs us. In Georges also may be found *obtulit* (p. 167 'je n'ai trouvé ce mot mentionné nulle part'), and *sperator* (Aug. serm. 20 § 4) which is omitted by M. Regnier, as is the Horatian *dilatator* (serm. 40 § 5. Cf. Migne 90 130*l*). In p. 173 *latura* n.s. is ascribed to 'Juv.', instead of to Juvenal's scholiast (Georges).

Many of the passages cited are no way characteristic of low Latin. Thus p. 19 *ad fin.* 'serm. 2 c. 4 f. *solvat mihi quaestionem quam modo proposui.* Cette dernière [phrase] contient même deux verbes, qui, eux aussi, sont là d'un emploi tout français.' They also occur in Quintilian.

Many abstract substantives are erroneously cited, as used anomalously. Thus *admiratio* in serm. 283 c. 3 'invenis aliquando hominem acutissimum, memorem ad incredibilem admirationem.' The word is here taken in the common acceptance; but it is worth while to compare the whole phrase *ad admirationem* (our 'to admiration') with Pliny's *usque in admirationem*.

Relatio, in a different sense from that cited in lexx., occurs s. 300 § 3 'testamentum enim vetus *relatio* est novi testamenti, et testamentum novum *revelatio* est veteris testamenti.'

Coronator, cited in lexx. from serm. 318 (§ 3 fin.) occurs also 300 § 6; *lapidator*, only known from Cic. p. domo, s. 49 § 10. 315 § 6. 318 § 1. 382 § 3.

An interesting example of *valere* = *convalescere* (Fr. 'vaut') occurs s. 37 c. 3 *post med.* 'pretiosi lapides ideo dicti sunt, quia *cari valent.*' Georges has the same expression from the 'confessions.'

I hope that the publisher may be encouraged to continue the series of monographs on patristic Latin, and to append a complete *index verborum* to each instalment. Even as it is, this book is necessary to every serious student of post-Augustan Latinity.

—J. F. R. M.

Chrysostom, a Study in the History of Biblical Interpretation, by F. H. CHASE, M.A., Christ's College, Cambridge. Bell and Co. 1887. pp. ix, 204.

THIS book is the Kaye Prize Essay of 1883 recast and rewritten. The writer sees many similarities between the difficulties of Chrysostom's age and those of our own. In particular, men's views about the Bible were not those of their predecessors. New methods of interpretation were transforming the old system, not only for scholars but for the multitude; for the results of criticism at once became public property through the popular expositions of the preacher. The Apologist, freed from his task of defending the faith, turned to the nobler work of expounding it. The struggle with Gnosticism showed the necessity of determining the contents of the New Testament: the struggle with Arianism showed the necessity of interpreting the contents of the whole Bible. And thus 'Chrysostom as a preacher is before all things the Interpreter of Scripture,' and in his hands the Bible became 'the manual of the Controversialist.'

The five chapters of the Essay are on the following topics:—The School of Antioch and Chrysostom's place in it: Chrysostom as an Interpreter of the Old Testament; as Critic and Scholar; as an Interpreter of the Gospels and the Acts; as an Interpreter of St. Paul's Epistles. Most of these chapters represent a large amount of self-denying work; work which at times must have been somewhat tedious, and which does not make a great deal of show, but which yields valuable results at the cost of very little trouble to those who care to profit by what Mr. Chase has done for them. How much reading, for instance, is implied in the 'four main Canons of Interpretation', which he has formulated as 'implied in Chrysostom's treatment of the Prophetic Books' (p. 69); or in the tabulated specimens of Chrysostom's treatment of the Greek Article, the Genitive, the Particles, the Prepositions, &c., and of his discussions of Etymologies, Synonyms, and the like. Here, again, is a useful piece of work:—

'Chrysostom's comparative silence on the subject of variations of reading seems to be an indication that he regarded the question of text as authoritatively settled. His archiepiscopate at Constantinople gave a quasi-formal sanction in that metropolis of Christianity to the traditions and decisions of the Antiochenes. Hence the importance of his position in regard to the history of the text of the New Testament. I propose briefly to discuss passages where S. Chrysostom (1) notices a variation of reading, or (2) a variation of punctuation; or (3) adopts a reading to which for some reason interest attaches' (p. 83).

This proposal is carried out, and then Mr. Chase thus sums up the result.

'A review of Chrysostom's relation to textual questions appears to warrant three inferences:—(1) The rarity of any direct discussion on a matter of reading seems to confirm the theory that some authoritative settlement of the text had taken place; (2) the character of the few discussions we have noticed shews that the typical Antiochene teacher took surface plausibility as the standard of excellence; (3) the survival of curious Pre-Syrian readings, sometimes early traditional readings, oftener Western, may suggest the conclusion that the Antiochene recension was but recent in Chrysostom's time' (p. 89).

All this will be very unwelcome to those who agree with the author of *The Revision Revised* that the Syrian revision of the text of the New Testament is a mere fiction, and that the so-called *textus receptus*, to which Chrysostom's text closely approximates, is on the whole a very pure one. But those who are

already convinced that the reverse of this is the truth will be grateful to Mr. Chase for the evidence which he has collected for them in confirmation of what has already been established or rendered probable. The volume is a useful one from various points of view: and students may be grateful to the University of Cambridge for selecting this subject for the Kaye Prize and to Mr. Chase for the way in which he has treated it.—ALFRED PLUMMER.

Epochs of Church History. The Church of the Early Fathers (external history), by ALFRED PLUMMER, D. D. Master of University College, Durham. London. Longmans. 2s. 6d.

THE substance of Dr. Plummer's little work is excellent. It is carefully written, takes full account of recent research, and everywhere shews traces of wider reading. It is also provided with full chronological tables and lists of books which are likely to be useful to the student. I think, however, that in the arrangement of the work there is room for improvement. The general account of the churches as a whole and of their relations to the state is reserved for the last chapter, nearly two-thirds of what precedes being devoted to a formal series of histories of churches and their bishops, all duly traced down to the year 312. As the special histories are seriously cramped by the want of this information, would it not be better if, in a future edition, what is now the last chapter were placed immediately after the first? —H. M. G.

THREE BOOKS OF TRAVEL IN GREECE.

Rambles and Studies in Greece, by J. P. MAHAFFY; third edition, revised and enlarged. Macmillan. 1887. 10s. 6d.

Griechische Reise; Blätter aus dem Tagebuche einer Reise in Griechenland und in der Türkei; von KARL KRUMBACHER. Berlin. Hettler. 1886. 7 mk.

An Easter Vacation in Greece; by J. E. SANDYS. Macmillan. 1887. 3s. 6d.

THE appearance of a third edition of Professor Mahaffy's *Rambles and Studies in Greece* is a gratifying proof of the keen interest which the present generation takes in that country—a result to which this book, in all probability, has not a little contributed. Professor Mahaffy is a wit, a man of the world, and a many-sided observer, as well as a widely read scholar; and the quickness of his imagination, while it often invests with a poetical charm the objects which he describes, never betrays him into adopting groundless fancies. He has also many original ideas to communicate, and in expounding these, whether he persuades us or not, is always interesting. In describing the scope of his work he says—'My aim is to bring the living features of Greece home to the student, by connecting them, as far as possible, with the facts of older history, which are so familiar to most of us. I shall also have a good deal to say about the modern politics of Greece, and the character of the modern population.' Nothing could be better than this; and such a view accounts for his oft-repeated admiration for Byron's poetry, which has invested the country from both these points of view with a brilliant attractiveness. The present edition is a considerable expansion of the original work. Chapters on Olympia, and on Arcadia and the temple at Bassae, were inserted in the second edition, and to these is now added an account of Sparta and Messenia. His route from Argos to Sparta was the unfamiliar but beautiful one through the district of Kynuria by Hagios Petros;

and, in passing, we may recommend to future travellers who follow his footsteps to make the ascent of the neighbouring summit of Mount Parion, which, from its neighbourhood to the incomparable chain of Taygetus, and from its dominating the whole of the eastern Peloponnese and a vast expanse of sea, ought to present one of the finest panoramas in Greece. The following passage, describing early morning in the valley of Sparta, is characteristic of the writer, and none but a very skilled hand could have held so exactly the balance between the sublime and the ridiculous.

'On opening my window, I felt that I had attained one of the strange moments of life which can never be forgotten. The air was preternaturally clear and cold, and the sky beginning to glow faintly with the coming day. Straight before me, so close that it almost seemed within reach of voice, the giant Taygetus, which rises straight from the plain, stood up into the sky, its black and purple gradually brightening into crimson, and the cold blue-white of its snow warming into rose. There was a great feeling of peace and silence, and yet a vast diffusion of sound. From the whole plain, with all its home-steads and villages, myriads of cocks were proclaiming the advent of dawn. I had never thought there were so many cocks in all the world. The ever succeeding voices of these countless thousands kept up one continual wave of crowing, such as I suppose cannot be equalled anywhere else in the world; and yet for all that, as I have said, there was a feeling of silence, a sense that no other living thing was abroad, an absolute stillness in the air, a deep sleep over the rest of nature.'

The principal object which M. Krumbacher had in visiting the Aegean was the laudable one of examining the two MSS. of Julios Romanos, 'the greatest Christian hymn-writer,' which exist in the library of the monastery of St. John at Patmos. So important are these, that whereas Cardinal Pitra, on the strength of all that could be gleaned in Europe of Romanos' hymns, only edited twenty-nine, in Patmos there are over ninety. Of these M. Krumbacher, in the course of two visits to that island, made a complete study. He also devoted himself to the modern Greek language and its dialects, on which subject he is an authority, but the scientific results of his investigations he proposes to publish elsewhere, and meanwhile in the present volume he gives us the narrative of his journey. This comprised visits to Athens and Constantinople, and, on the continent of Asia Minor, to Ephesus and Tralles, to Magnesia and Sardis, and to Pergamon; but the greater part of his time was devoted to the Asiatic Greek islands—Rhodes, Leros, Patmos, Samos, Chios, and Lesbos. We wish we could say it is an interesting book. If M. Krumbacher had only remembered that the half—we might really say in this instance, the quarter—is more than the whole, and had given us 100 pages instead of 400, it would have been well worth reading; but, as it is, the most patient reader becomes exhausted by the constant recurrence of coffee-drinking, and bargaining, and interviews with officials, and other everyday occurrences, which can only be interesting to the person who experienced them. This is the more provoking, because M. Krumbacher was in many ways an excellent traveller. He observed carefully and with discrimination; his knowledge of the modern Greek language enabled him to communicate with those among whom he was thrown; and he had the great merit of possessing a strong sympathy for the people whom he visited, and especially for the lower classes. He is at his best when he narrates a

conversation between the islanders, which he overheard during a wakeful night on the deck of a vessel, on the subject of the animosities caused by the introduction of a diving apparatus among the sponge-fishers of those regions; or when he describes the difficulty of faithfully taking down popular songs from recitation, owing to the disposition of the people to 'correct' a dialectic form, if asked to repeat it, and the more serious risk of rough treatment, when he attempted to commit sailors' songs to writing; or when he relates from his own observation the custom of the children at Smyrna of singing the 'swallow-song' (χελιδόνισμα). It is also to his credit that he everywhere made diligent enquiries with regard to education, so that in the city of Rhodes we find him visiting the Jewish as well as the Greek school. Here and there we are able to pick up crumbs of scientific information, which he has let drop from what we doubt not is an ample store: thus he tells us that in the dialect of Chios he found peculiarities of pronunciation, which previously had been thought to belong only to the dialects of Cyprus and Trebizond; and in another place we learn that Sakellion, the former librarian of Patmos, has made a careful catalogue of that valuable library, though as yet it is unpublished. As regards the burning question of the modern language, his views are hostile to the learned idiom, but he thinks the reaction in favour of the spoken language has come too late, because the classical forms and constructions that have been introduced have become predominant. He justly observes that, whereas in other languages, when new ideas were introduced, new words were invented for them, in Modern Greek an immense number of words for ideas that had not before been entertained were all at once imported from ancient Greek, which was to all intents a different language; and whereas borrowed words elsewhere have been assimilated in form to the language into which they have been adopted, in Modern Greek not only were they introduced unchanged, but the old forms were assimilated to them.

Mr. Sandys' unpretending and pleasantly written little book contains an account of a month spent in Greece by the author and his wife during the spring

of last year, in the course of which they visited Athens and the principal places of interest in Attica, the Argive plain and its ancient sites, Corinth, Delphi, and Olympia. Some of the connecting points between these are also noticed, among which we may especially mention the Isthmian Stadium, a place not much noticed, though it lies near the beaten track. In the notes references are given to collections of inscriptions and other learned works which may be serviceable to the student after his return home, and quotations are introduced from the classics, which illustrate such points as are from time to time suggested by such a journey. Among these we remark that Mr. Sandys agrees with Professor Mahaffy in his estimate of that disenchanting plant, the asphodel: of this he says—'It will grow almost anywhere in waste places; so that the 'mead of asphodel,' in which Homer's heroes are described as pacing to and fro in the unseen world, would seem to imply a barren waste where other plants would hardly grow, and may perhaps find its closest parallel in the forlorn and desolate region which Virgil calls the *loca senta situ*' (p. 102; cp. Mahaffy, p. 392). At the end of the volume are two appendices, one of which contains a *catalogue raisonné* of books on Greek travel and subjects connected with it, the other a time-table of the numerous steamers which ply between the ports of Greece. A careful study of the latter of these will enable persons before leaving England to arrange their tours beforehand; and by the help of these means of transit such travellers as are content with passing glimpses may now reach comparatively remote places, such as the islands of Melos, Amorgos, and Seyros, and can be brought within range of some of the finest scenery in Greece, such as that in the neighbourhood of the Maliac and Pagasæan gulfs. If we are to believe the travelling servants of Athens, the days of extended tours in Greece are at an end, and their place is taken by short and rapid excursions which are rendered easy by the increased facilities for locomotion. The change appears an inevitable one, however much we may regret it, and those who are contented with the second best course will find in this volume much that is suggestive for their purpose.

H. F. TOZER.

NOTES.

THE CONDITIONAL SENTENCE IN LATIN.

[To save time, the following remarks of Mr. Sonnenschein were forwarded to Mr. Roby, who has added the notes appended.]

THERE are two points in Mr. Roby's criticism of my paper on which I may perhaps be permitted to say a few words:

Without implication.

- Present time* ... (1) Si ita facit, errat
Past time ... (2) Si ita faciebat (fecit), errabat (erravit)
Future time ... (3) Si ita faciet (fecerit), errabit (erraverit)

The points at issue may be summed up by saying that I consider that (6) corresponds to (3). Mr. Roby considers that in ordinary cases (6) corresponds to (1);¹ and he distinguishes (4) from (6) by saying

¹ I must refer to my own words in § 1507, as at once more full and precise.—H. J. R.

(4) The normal use of the Present, as distinct from the Imperfect, Subjunctive.

(B) The meaning of such a sentence as *Erat unum iter, Herdam si reverti vellent, alterum si Tarraconem peterent*.

(4) My scheme of the ordinary use of moods and tenses in Conditional sentences would stand thus:

With implication.

- (4) Si ita faceret, erraret [but he is not doing (does not do) so].
 (5) Si ita fecisset, erravisset [but he did not do so].
 (6) Si ita faciat, erret [but I do not say he will do so].

that (6) expresses an action supposed to occur (momentary act),² (4) an action supposed to be (or have been) already occurring (continuous state).³ This I

² I have not said this. But it would have been better if I had added the words 'or state' to 'action' in § 1530a.—H. J. R.

³ 'Or action.'—H. J. R.

infer to be the meaning of § 1530. Mr. Roby criticises my terminology in regard to (6): 'Future condition with reserve.' All that I meant by 'reserve,' was an implication warning the reader not to suppose the writer means that the condition will be fulfilled. I think there is a palpable difference between a protasis with such an implication and a protasis with no implication at all; between 'if he were to do it [I do not say he will]' and 'if he does (shall do) it.'¹

Mr. Roby's formula for (4) 'if he had been doing it, he would have been making a mistake (cf. § 1518 f.) is certainly convenient as covering two senses of the Imperfect: my only objection to it is that it does not give sufficient prominence to the fact (as to which I am glad to find that I am in accord with Mr. Roby) that in the large majority of instances in the classical period, the tense refers to what is called present time: *i.e.* to the time denoted by the Present Indicative. In Plautus the tense refers to the past far more commonly: whether in such cases it always denotes 'continued action in the past,' I think doubtful.

(B) 'There was one road, if they wanted to return to Ilerda, another if they were to go to Tarraco.' How does Mr. Roby deal with such a sentence as this?² His §§ 1566—1570 (conditions qualifying an infinitive, future participle or gerundive) do not cover it; it would therefore seem that he regards it as falling

¹ There is a difference between pres. subj. and fut. ind. The former is used of an action thereby indicated as not real; the latter has no implication. If Prof. Sonnenschein means this, I agree.—H. J. R.

² This sentence implies a suppressed apodosis. See § 1750 a-c. The condition does not qualify *erat iter*. There was a road in any case. The word *habendum* or the like, or *quod haberent*, would be the proper apodosis to *si...vellent* &c. H. J. R.

under the ordinary cases of protasis with Imperfect Subjunctive. Yet how absurd would it be to suppose that the implication is 'they did not want to go to Ilerda,' &c. ! the sentence clearly implies that neither alternative is rejected.³ In his preface (p. xcix.) he says, 'The Subjunctive has been formed, or at least is applied, in order to warn the hearer that the event is *thought*, and only *thought*;' and with this I entirely agree (see my note, *Classical Review*, p. 126). But there are two different effects of marking an action as 'thought:' I may either imply that the fact is otherwise, or I may imply that I do not say the fact is so. These two things ought either to be kept apart; or else the general formula covering them both ought to be given as in the Preface and not as in the body of the Grammar (e.g. 1530 c). Mr. Roby's § 1566 would lead one to suppose that he sees no grammatical difference between *Omnibus cum contumeliis onerasti, quem patris loco, si ulla in te pietas esset* (if you had any sense of duty), *colere debebas*, and *Pompeius munitiones Caesaris prohibere non poterat, nisi praelio decertare vellet* (without deciding to fight). I regard the first as containing a rejected condition, and the second as containing a condition which is not rejected.⁴ How such conditions should be treated is the point on which I ventured to say that further investigation was required: I do not regard the view common to many new German grammars (e.g. *Lattmann*, § 178, *Anm.* 2) that we have here a 'Potential Subjunctive' as satisfactory.

E. A. SONNENSCHNEIN.

³ The subj. implies that neither alternative was then actually adopted, but nothing more. It denotes an imaginary, not a real, action.—H. J. R.

⁴ In both cases the subj. by itself denotes nothing more than the non-actuality of the action or state.—H. J. R.

[It may not be unacceptable to some of our readers to have the main points in this discussion laid distinctly before them. It will be remembered that the four propositions condemned in Mr. Sonnenschein's original paper were (1) that the Ind. in the protasis implies reality, (2) that the Pres. Subj. implies possibility, (3) that the Imp. Subj. refers primarily to the past, (4) that the Imp. Subj. in Latin is the equivalent of the Greek Optative (*si quid haberet, daret* = *εἰ τι ἔχοι διδοίη ἔν*). Both disputants are agreed as to (1), (2), (4); even as to (3) both allow that the Imp. Subj. is used with reference both to present and to past time, and that it more often refers to the present than to the past; but while Mr. Sonnenschein speaks of the latter usage as exceptional in the writers of the best age, Mr. Roby treats this as the normal, and the other as the secondary use. The point is somewhat subtle, but the following reasons incline me to side with Mr. Roby in his contention. There is a *prima facie* probability that any special use of a tense will have its starting-point in the general meaning of the tense; hence it is probable that the Imp. Subj. of the hypothetical sentence had, to begin with, a reference to a continued action or state in the past; and this probability is confirmed by the fact mentioned by Mr. Sonnenschein, that in the oldest Latin writings the reference to the past is more common than in Cicero and later authors. Mr. Roby's excellent distinction that 'the Imp. Subj. is used in these sentences when you contemplate the present as the resultant of the past, and the Pres. Subj. used when you contemplate the present as the starting-point of the future,' enables us to see how naturally the tense, which properly denotes a con-

tinuous past, gets to include present time as well; and this is illustrated by the use of the Greek Imp. Ind. with *ἄν* and our own 'would have,' in such a sentence as that quoted by Mr. Sonnenschein, 'If I had not been Alexander I would fain have been Diogenes.' In what respect does this differ from 'If I were not Alexander I would fain be Diogenes'? Surely only in the fact that, while both refer to present time, the former views the present as a consequence of the past, the latter regards it in itself without looking back to the past; and thus the former comes to imply the impossibility of the hypothetical case, the contrary being supposed already fixed unchangeably. We may translate both *si ego rex sim* and *si ego rex essem* by the words 'if I were King'; but, while the former simply implies 'as I am not,' the latter has the further implication 'as I never can be.' I do not think this implication can ever have been absent from the mind of a Roman, when he used the Imp. Subj., because, however far a word or phrase may depart from its original use, yet until the old use has become entirely obsolete, it is impossible for the new use to be unaffected by it. The Greek aorist got to be used with a present force in such phrases as *τί οὐκ ἐποίησας; ἐπῆνεσα*, but it carried with it the quality of instantaneousness—no sooner said than done. It would seem then that we cannot accept Mr. Sonnenschein's symmetrical scheme of tenses. Not only is the Imp. used with reference both to past and to present time, but the Pres. also is used both of a future which is already beginning, and, as Mr. Sonnenschein allows, of present time without reference to a future, as in *N.D.* iii. 79, *nam si current (di homines), bene bonis sit, male malis; quod nunc*

abest. I think therefore that the true scheme of hypothetical tenses would give at least two to each time, *faciat* and *faceret* to the present, *faceret* and *fecisset* to the past, *faciat* and *facturus sit* to the future.

There are other points which might invite discussion, e.g. the criticism of Prof. Goodwin's view of the conditional forms in Greek, and the use of the subjunctive in auxiliary verbs. Something may be said on these in a future number of the *Review*, but there is just one slight point which may be noticed here. Mr. Sonnenschein protests against the combination of *should* and *would* in such a phrase as 'If he should do it, it would be well,' holding that the proper phrase is 'If he were to do it'; but there are many cases in which 'should' is more appropriate than 'were to,' e.g. 'If it should appear that you were present on that occasion, it would be very awkward for you,' 'If you should be going to town that day, you would find him at his office,' 'If he should come in whilst you were there, what excuse would you make?'—J. B. M.]

ON SOPH. *Electr.* 561, AND EUR. *I. T.* 15 AND 35.
—In the second *ἐπεισόδιον* of Sophocles' *Electra* Clytemnestra has arraigned Agamemnon in a set speech for the sacrifice of Iphigenia and has challenged Electra to justify his deed: *δίδαξον δὴ με τοῦ χάριν τίνων ἔθυσεν αὐτήν*. Electra in her reply meets this challenge with a counter-question, vv. 563 sq.

ἐροῦ δὲ τὴν κυναγὸν Ἀρτεμιν τίνος
ποιᾶς τὰ πολλὰ πνεύματ' ἔσχ' ἐν Αὐλίδι.

These lines are explained by Hermann to mean 'ask Artemis why she restrained the frequent winds at Aulis;' and indeed I do not see what other meaning can be wrung from the Greek: Mr. Jebb has rightly abandoned his former interpretation by which *ὁ πατήρ*, that is Agamemnon, was imported from so far away as the *πατέρα* of v. 558 to oust the intervening Ἀρτεμιν as the subject of *ἔσχε*. But Hermann's explanation, inexorably demanded by the words, is disastrous to the sense. Artemis did not restrain the winds at Aulis: had she done so, Agamemnon might have laughed her to scorn and Iphigenia would never have been sacrificed. To the ships of the heroic age and the age of Sophocles alike, a calm was no hindrance: they were equipped with oars. What it was that kept the fleet at Aulis we know very well from Aesch. *Aj.* 202 sqq. and fifty other sources; we know that it was not a calm, but contrary winds. I am aware that Ovid in *met.* XIII 183 has blundered into the phrase '*nulla aut contraria classi flamina erant*,' but that is in an opus mediis incudibus ablatum: emendaturus, si licuisset, erat. The question to ask of Artemis will then, I think, be this:

τίνος
ποιᾶς τὰ πολλὰ πνεύματ' ἔσχ' ἐν Αὐλίδι

why gales detained the fleet at Aulis. Had we before us the series of MSS. by which the text was handed down, we should probably find that the inversion of two consecutive letters, a most frequent error, first changed *πλοῖα* to *πολιά*; this once done, the difference between *λι* and *λα* is so evanescent that the further corruption *πολλά* scarcely merits the name of a change.

Misled by this passage, Hermann and others have endeavoured to introduce by conjecture a reference to this imaginary calm into Eur. *I. T.* 15. These conjectures I do not propose to discuss, as they seem to be put out of court by the considerations already

adduced; but the verse is a celebrated crux and will perhaps repay examination. The passage vv. 10.-16 runs thus:

10 ἐνταῦθα γὰρ δὴ χιλίων ναῶν στόλον
Ἑλληνικὸν συνήγαγ' Ἀγαμέμνων ἄναξ
τὸν καλλίνικον στέφανον Ἴλλου θέλων
λαβεῖν Ἀχαιοῖς, τοὺς θ' ὕβρισθέντας γάμους
Ἑλένης μετελθεῖν, Μενέλεω χάριν φέρων.
15 δεινῆς τ' ἀπλοίας πνευμάτων τ' οὐ τυγχάνων
εἰς ἔμπυρ' ἦλθε, καὶ λέγει Κάλχχας τάδε·

There is only one way of construing v. 15 so as to make sense: *δεινῆς ἀπλοίας* must be genitive absolute: 'as there was a dreadful impossibility of sailing and as he found the wind unfavourable.' But it is first of all apparent that *δέ*, not *τε*, is the conjunction demanded at the beginning of the verse; so Barnes, followed almost universally, alters *τ'* to *δ'*. Next, the ambiguity of the language is found unpardonable: the reader is inevitably led to construe *ἀπλοίας*, like *πνευμάτων*, with *οὐ τυγχάνων*; a construction which he then discovers to make nonsense of the passage. Hence the verse has been assailed by a host of conjectures, for the most part very unscientific; indeed the only one which seems to deserve mention is Madvig's. He proposes simply *δεινῇ δ' ἀπλοῖα*: the co-ordination of the causal dative with the causal participle is of course quite correct and natural. But the assumed error is not easily explicable: although *δέ* and *τε* are often enough confused, and although you might find here and there an instance of dative and genitive inflexions exchanged through sheer carelessness, still we can hardly postulate with prudence the occurrence of both mistakes together. And what is worse, we still have not rid the line of a third flaw pointed out by Badham: the flatness of the epithet *δεινῇ* might be tolerated by an indulgent schoolmaster in the verses of a beginner, but in this prince of rhetoricians it is surprising. The line is not emended till all three faults, of connexion, of construction, and of diction, are extirpated; and the sagacity of Badham told us years ago to look for the root of the evil in the letters *δεινῆς τ'*. And there, sure enough, we find it. The letters *δ-ει-νηστ* are the letters *νηστ-ει-δ*; and here, I fancy, is the hand of Euripides:

νήσται δ' ἀπλοῖα πνευμάτων τ' οὐ τυγχάνων
εἰς ἔμπυρ' ἦλθε.

The attraction of *ἀπλοῖα* into the case of *δεινῆς* is an error which has abundant examples and may almost be called inevitable. We know that famine was, as might be expected, the chief suffering of the weather-bound fleet; and in fact Euripides is here giving a verbal reproduction of the account in Aesch. *Aj.* 195 sqq. *εὗτ' ἀπλοῖα κεν αἰγυγεῖ βαρύνοντ' Ἀχαιῆς* *λεῶς* . . . *πλοῖα δ' ἀπὸ Στρυμόνος μολοῦσαι, κακὸς-χολοί, νήσταιδες, δῶσορμοι* . . . *κατέξαινον ἄνθος Ἀργείων*.

Transpositions of letters and syllables such as I have here assumed are naturally regarded by many as *a priori* improbable. The fact that they are frequent is well known to the alert and diligent student of Greek and Latin MSS.; and the confusion of mind or eye which begets them has survived the introduction of printing: on p. 156 of vol. I of *The Classical Review* will be found such corrigenda to Holder's Herodotus as *ταῦτα* for *τταῦτα*, *ἐστρατεύετο* for *ατέστρεύετο*, the latter a curiously apt parallel. It is impossible here to illustrate this subject as it might be illustrated and as I hope some day to illustrate it; but there occurs in this same *πρόλογος* a crux perhaps yet more notorious than v. 15, where

I seem to detect a similar cause at work. Iphigenia relates how Artemis bore her away from Aulis to the land of the Tauri—

ναῦσι δ' ἐν τοῖσδ' ἱερῶν τίθησί με,
35 ὅθεν νόμοισι, τοῖσιν ἥδεται θεὰ
Ἄρτεμις, ἑορτῆς, τοῦνομ' ἧς καλὸν μόνον
τὰ δ' ἄλλα σιγῶ τὴν θεὸν φοβουμένη.
θύω γάρ, ὅντος τοῦ νόμου καὶ πρὶν πόλει,
ὅς ἂν κατέλθῃ τήνδε γῆν Ἑλλήν ἀνὴρ.

So reads the best MS. Now we have here beginning with v. 35 a sentence which gets no further than the three words ὅθεν νόμοισιν ἑορτῆς: there is a relative clause subjoined to νόμοισι by τοῖσιν; there is another relative clause subjoined to ἑορτῆς by ἧς: at the end of this clause we come to a full stop, and begin an entirely new sentence introduced by an inferential particle. The heroes who undertake the defence of the text say that we have here an aposiopesis. Aposiopesis is a comforting word; but the sphere of the figure so named is limited by conditions which here preclude it. In cases of aposiopesis it is requisite that we should be able to form a notion how the speaker was about to complete the sentence which he breaks off: this is obviously necessary to the understanding of the situation, because it is the thought of the suppressed words which causes to arise in his mind the emotion which restrains him from uttering them. But here the spoken part of the sentence consists only of three words, and we cannot tell the meaning of the first or the construction of the second: we cannot tell whether ὅθεν means *since* *which time* or *for which reason*; we cannot tell whether the inflexion of νόμοισι means *with* or *by* or *in* or *for* or *to* or *because of*: much less then can we guess how the sentence would proceed. Hence this reading is now defended, I think, by no scholar of repute: a few have tried to mend matters by eliciting τοῖσιδ' from the τοῖσιδ' of the second-best MS. in v. 35. We do indeed thus get a sentence, with ἥδεται for its principal verb; but sense is as far off as ever. The sacrifices, as the words ὅντος τοῦ νόμου καὶ πρὶν πόλει inform us, were instituted, not upon the arrival of Iphigenia, but long before; and there is no imaginable way in which Artemis' delight in them can have been caused by anything recounted in the narrative which has preceded. Therefore other conjectures have been proposed, of which I mention Weil's as the most ingenious and plausible. He retains τοῖσιν, strikes out Ἄρτεμις as a gloss on θεά, and replaces it by χρώμεσθ'. This, to be sure, is good sense; yet the hypothesis is precarious. The officiousness of the scribe is surely excessive and not complimentary to our intelligence: what goddess but Artemis could we dream of? Again how often θεά and ἡ θεός recur in this play for Artemis I do not waste time in counting, but it is very often indeed; yet nowhere else has the scribe importuned us with the explanation. I prefer then to look for light to the ductus litterarum; and I will suggest that if there once stood in the text the letters ΝΟΜΟΙΣΙΝΟΘΕΝΕΙΟΙΣΙΝ it required only the inversion of the two consecutive letters NE, and the infinitesimally slight change of T for I, to produce ΝΟΜΟΙΣΙΝ ΟΘΕΝ ΤΟΙΣΙΝ; and that the only way to make metre of this was to arrange the words as they now stand in the MS., ὅθεν νόμοισι τοῖσιν. But the sentence

νόμοις ἔν' ὀθνελοισιν ἥδεται θεὰ
Ἄρτεμις ἑορτῆς

where Artemis delights in strange rites is surely just what is wanted; and it is curious to note how closely van Herwerden has approached to this sense with his conjecture ὅπου νόμοις ὠμοῖσιν. —A. E. HOUSMAN.

AI SCHYLOS, *Agamemnon*, 1227—1230.

νεῶν τ' ἐπαρχος Ἰλίου τ' ἀναστάτης
οὐκ οἶδεν οἷα γλῶσσα μισητῆς κυνὸς
λέξασα κακτεῖνασα φαιδρόνους δίκην
ἄτης λαθραίου τεύξεται κακῇ τύχῃ (1230).

This passage has exercised the ingenuity of scholars and many clever emendations have been proposed: nevertheless I believe that the MSS. reading (which I give with the exception of κακτεῖνασα, the inevitable correction of the irrelevant καὶ κτεῖνασα) gives better sense than any reading that has been suggested.

It is to be observed that Cassandra utters her prophetic revelations in two forms. She first in her lyrical laments perplexes the chorus with ἐπάργυμα θέσφατα (1072—1177), a series of dark pictures, drawn with a few quick strokes; but then she unveils the oracle (1178) and presents to the puzzled elders the same pictures, but painted in more detail and brought into more intelligible connexion. It is important to note that the general order of the prophecies delivered in iambs is the same as that of the lyrical utterances, and that the correspondence is emphasised by the repetition of the same or similar words. Compare for example 1037 with 1186, 1093 with 1185, 1095sqg. with 1217sqg., &c. Thus φαιδρόνους (1229) may suggest λουτροῖσι φαιδρόνασα in 1109.

Now in 1115—17 we find the remarkable conception of the net; ἡ δίκτυόν τι Αἴδου; ἀλλ' ἄρκυς ἡ ξύνευνος, ἡ ξυναιτία φόνου, which is plainly a covert reference to the ἀπειρον ἀμφίβληστρον which Klytaimnestra afterwards describes (1382). We might expect that Cassandra would again refer to the net in her unveiled oracle, which is intended to explain the obscurities of her former words. I would suggest that there is such a reference in the present passage and that the word δίκη was an old word for 'net', 'casting-net', being closely connected with δίκτυον and related to δικεῖν as βόλος is related to βάλλω. The meaning then will be; 'He knoweth not what words the tongue of the lewd hound will speak and how having stretched out with blithe soul a net of stealthy ruin she will succeed therein (in achieving the ruin) with an ill success.' After οἷα it was unnecessary to express ὡς with ἐκτεῖνασα; and there is no difficulty in understanding κύων from the preceding κυνός.

In support of this interpretation I would further remark that in l. 1611 there may well be a suggestion of the secondary sense of δίκη: ἰδόντα τοῦτον τῆς δίκης ἐν ἔρκεσιν. Moreover the phrase δίκην ἄτης λαθραίου has a close parallel in a passage in the *Prometheus*, 1077:

κοῦκ ἐξαίφνης οὐδὲ λαθραίως
εἰς ἀπέραντον δίκτυον ἄτης
ἐμπλεχθήσεσθ' ὑπ' ἀνολας.¹

AI SCHYLOS *Agamemnon*, 1310. τὸδ' ὄξει θυμάτων ἐφeskίων. Does not the Chorus in these words intend to suggest Ου-έστῃς? —J. B. BURY.

EURIPIDES, *Orestes*, 399.

M. τί χρηῖμα πάσχεις; τίς σ' ἀπόλλυσιν νόσος;
O. ἡ σύνεσις ὅτι σύννοϊδα δελν' εἰργασμένος.
M. πῶς φῆς; σοφόν τοι τὸ σαφές, οὐ τὸ μὴ σαφές.
O. λύπη μάλιστά γ' ἡ διαφθείρουσά με.
M. δεινὴ γὰρ ἡ θεός τ', ἀλλ' ὅμως ἰάσιμος. (399)

The reading of the MSS. in 399 cannot be right. For (1) it is extremely unlikely that Euripides would

¹ ἐμπλεχθήσεσθ' made me entertain for a moment the idea of reading πλέξασα for λέξασα in *Agamemnon* 1229; but there is no reason to change the MSS. reading. Nevertheless if Aeschylus wrote πλέξασα the proximity of γλῶσσα would inevitably cause it to be corrupted to λέξασα.

speak of *λύπη* as a goddess, and (2) *ἡ θεός* is quite incongruous with *ἰάσιμος*. Of these objections the first is serious, and the second is fatal to *ἡ θεός*. Weil proposed to read *ἡ σήψ*, a reading which not only introduces an unlikely word but departs altogether from the MSS. I venture to propose that the right reading is

δεινὴ γὰρ ἡθεός ἀλλ' ὅμως ἰάσιμος.

ἡθεός is used by medical writers of the character or nature of a disease, and is consequently appropriate here.—J. B. BURY.

NOTES ON THE SCHOLIA OF THE PLUTUS.—

(1) Dübner, p. 321b. ll. 17–22.

3. τὸ ἦν ἀπόστροφον λαμβάνει, ὃ ἐστὶν ἀντίστροφον. ἔστι δὲ ὥσπερ καὶ ἄλλως τὸναντίον δρῶν· καὶ τοῦτο γὰρ ἀντίστροφον δέχεται. ἔστι γὰρ τὸ ἐναντίον δρῶν. ἡ δὲ ἀπόστροφος ἀντίστροφος καλεῖται. Ἀρίσταρχος γὰρ τοῦτο σημειοῦται. ὃ ἐστὶν παρ' ἡμῖν ἀπόστροφος, ἀντίστροφος αὐτῇ καλεῖται. This has no meaning as it stands, or when it purports to be a scholium upon the *ἦν* in the lines

ἦν γὰρ τὰ βέλτισθ' ὁ θεράπων λέξας τύχη,
δόξη δὲ μὴ δρᾶν τὰτα τῷ κεκτημένῳ,

5. μετέχειν ἀνάγκη τὸν θεράποντα τῶν κακῶν.

It contains, however, as kernel a real ancient *σχόλιον* from the school of Aristarchus. It is an explanation of a critical mark by Aristarchus, and represents the master's way of taking *μὴ δρᾶν* in l. 4. It has nothing to do with *ἦν* in the previous line. Perhaps the earliest form of the note was τὸ χ' τοῦτο γὰρ ἀντίστροφον δέχεται ἔστι γὰρ τὸ ἐναντίον δρᾶν. The master's critical mark *χ* is possibly concealed in the *καί* before *τοῦτο*, or the *καί* may be due to the compiler of the scholia in their present shape who often thus sweeps together into one note different ways of saying the same thing. In any case the first part of the scholium is also a corrupted explanation of the mark used by Aristarchus, perhaps the explanation of another pupil, viz. τὸ μὴ ἀντίστροφον λαμβάνει· ἔστι δὲ ὥσπερ καὶ ἄλλως τὸναντίον δρᾶν. 'He (the master) takes *μὴ* as reversing the sense; it is as also might be said in another way *to do the reverse*.' The words Ἀρίσταρχος γὰρ τοῦτο σημειοῦται make still another distinct ancient note, while the *ἡ δὲ ἀπόστροφος ἀντίστροφος καλεῖται* and the closing words are later additions.

(2) On the *θεσπιφδεῖν* of l. 9 the Ravenna MS. has what seems to be a like ancient scholium. τυμολογεῖ θεσπιφδεῖν. . . ἀρα τὴν θέμιν ἐκεῖ τὰς μαντείας ἔχειν. (cp. Dübner, p. 325a. ll. 44–46). This ought to be emended thus: ἐτυμολογεῖ θεσπιφδεῖν παρὰ τὸ κατὰ τὴν θέμιν ἐκεῖ τὰς μαντείας ἄδειν. 'He (the master) gives as the derivation of *θεσπιφδεῖν* that at Delphi he (Apollo) chants (*ἄδειν*) his prophecies in accord with justice (*θέμις*).'

(3) l. 66 on *ῶ τᾶν ἀπαλλάχθητον ἀπ' ἐμοῦ* the Ravenna MS. has preserved another note of Aristarchus' school. . . ὅτι οὐ πρὸς ἓνα μόνον τὸ ῶ τᾶν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς δύο. The three obliterated letters are best replaced by τὸ χ'. 'The *χ* because the *ῶ τᾶν* is addressed not to one only but to two.'

(4) The genesis of the unintelligible parts of the scholia is well illustrated by the Ravenna scholium on l. 74.

νῆ τοὺς θεοὺς ἡμεῖς γ', εἰν βούλη γε σὺ.

It is as follows:—*εἰ δ' ἄν* ἰδοὺ ἀπολύομεν· τοῦτο δὲ φασὶν ἀπολύσαντες αὐτόν. This is really an explanation of the closing words of the next line—

A. μέθεσθ' εὖν μου πρῶτον. B. ἦν, μεθίμεν.

The other MSS. have gone still further astray as may be seen by reading Dübner, p. 328b. ll. 45–52.

(5) An editor's critical mark is lost in a scholium on *μιαρώτατε ἀνδρῶν* in l. 78. (Dübner, 329a. l. 27) *ὅτι ἐν σχήματι ἀνδρὸς ἐφάνη ὁ Πλούτος*.

(6) We may be sure that the lost critical mark in a scholium on *θύσειεν* in l. 137 was Aristarchean, *ὅτι καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ θυμῖσαι τὸ θύειν*. There is not the same certainly in either of the following—

(7) l. 169 *Κορινθίας· δηλοῖ ὡς ἀπὸ Λαίδος· Κορινθία γὰρ ἦν*. 'He (the master) explains how it comes from *Lais*; for she was of *Corinth*;' or

(8) on l. 151 *οὐδὲ προσέχειν τὸν νοῦν· ὅτι οὐ μόνον οὐ προσδιαλέγονται, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ὀρώσι σχεδόν*. (mark) 'that not only do they not accost them, but almost do not even look at them.'

(9) An Aristarchean note may, however, be recovered from two scholia on l. 155, (see Dübner, p. 331b. l. 42) *τὸ χ' ὅτι ἀρσενικῶς ὁ πόρνος καὶ θηλυκῶς· ζητεῖσθω δὲ εἰ καὶ οὐδετέρως*.

(10) A few lines above (p. 331b. ll. 27–30) a convincing emendation results from reading *αἰδοῖον* for *ἄτοπον*, converting the following accusative into the genitive, and the verb *ἐπισείειν* into the substantive *ἐπίσειον*. The *οὐ* before *σφόδρα* in the MSS. is then explained.—W. GUNION RUTHERFORD.

CAES. B. G. iv. 17. THE BRIDGE OVER THE RHINE, (above, p. 168, 9.)—I have always taken the *fibulae* to be horizontal bolts piercing the beams (*trabes*) at right angles, one on each side of the junction of the beams with the piles, so as to prevent the beams slipping away from the piles. This latter effect is exactly expressed by *quibus disclusis et in contrariam partem revinctis*, 'which (upper and lower) pairs of piles being (thus) kept apart and at the same time bound together, the construction was made tighter by the action of the water'. The action of the stream on the upper face of the upper piles tended to increase their slope and thus approximate the higher portions of the upper piles with the lower piles, which would perhaps not be materially affected by the stream. The inner bolts kept them apart, the outer bolts bound, as it were, the upper and lower pairs of piles together, and this latter action was in the opposite direction (*in contrariam partem*) to the former action. *Utrique* and *utrimque* I take to refer to both pairs, (upper and lower). Hence I require only four bolts for each two pairs. I cannot see how *quibus* can be separated from *disclusis*, which would thus be left without any subject expressed.

The only point on which I feel some doubt is whether *fibula* would be used for a simple bolt—a straight piece of iron or wood passed through the beam. A bar of iron with the two ends bent at right angles to the centre and with one end fixed in the *trabes* at each side of the junction with the piles (*tigina*) would better answer the notion of a clasp (*fibula*) but would not be so simple and effective a mode of construction. And had they iron on the spot?

Cross-pieces—thirty to forty feet long—as Napoleon supposes, seem to me utterly alien to the notion of *fibulae*.

Whether a bridge so constructed would require braces between each pair of piles in the direction across the stream is a question for engineers. The *directa materia*, if properly fastened to the *trabes* and to the banks, would I suppose act as a brace. The depth to which the piles were driven and the nature of the bed of the river would have an important bearing on the matter.—H. J. ROBY.

NOTE ON HOR. *Epod.* xvii. 32,—

ae Sicana feruida
Uirens in Ac'na flamma.

Uirens is the reading of the best MSS.; others have

furens or *urens*. Editors generally retain *uirens*, though they do not agree as to the exact meaning of the word, of which they offer the three following interpretations: (1) That it is a synonym for *uigans*, (2) That it refers to the green colour of the sulphurous flames, (3) That it is equivalent to *fulgens*. In support of this rendering they cite Plautus, *Menæchmi* 818 (Vahlen),

Uiden tu illi oculos uirere?

Here however Ritschl proposes to substitute *lurere* for *uirere*, and I would ask if a similar change should not be made in the present passage of the *Epodes*. *Lurens* seems precisely the word required to describe the lurid fires of the volcano, and Ovid (*Met.* XIV. 791) actually uses *lurida* as an epithet of *sulfura*.

J. H. ONIONS.

MACROB. Sat. vii 4 § 7 *nec tertium defuisset exemplum, ita esse vitandam ciborum varietatem ut varia solent vina mutari*. So it runs in Eyssenhardt's edition; the context convinced me that the last word should be *vitari*; cf. c. 5 § 15 *et ideo varia vina vitantur*. On turning to Jan's edition I find that MS. P has *mutari*, but Jan with the margin of MS. II reads *vitari*. This is not the only place in which Eyssenhardt has forsaken his predecessor for the worse.—J. E. B. M.

APSYRTUS.—In the preface (§ 3) to his *Mulomedicina* Vegetius speaks contemptuously of the style of his predecessor Apsyrtus. From Suidas (s. v. Ἀψυρτος) we learn that Apsyrtus wrote in Greek. The Latin version found by Prof. Wilh. Meyer (cod. Monac. 243) at München, confirms the censure of Vegetius. Prof. Meyer promises critical editions of Apsyrtus, Vegetius and Pelagonius (*Archiv für lat. Lexik.* III 588, citing *Sitzungsber. d. bayr. Akad. d. Wiss.* Philol.—philos.—histor. Klasse, 1885, p. 395).—J. E. B. M.

DIFFICULTIES IN JUVENAL.—It is with extreme diffidence that I venture to re-suggest some of the old difficulties connected with Juvenal's Satires, and I do so really in the hope of eliciting a solution of them from English authorities on the subject. The first I will notice is the custom of the *sportula* as represented by Juvenal, which in two or three important particulars is quite unknown to Martial, who beyond a doubt was an eye-witness of what he described. Juvenal for example represents it as distributed in the morning. Professor Friedländer calls this an unimportant difference. I cannot agree with him. Considering the rigid uniformity of Roman society life under the Empire, such a difference in two writers describing Roman manners at about the same period seems to me most puzzling. Suppose two writers describing Cambridge University life should one of them represent the time for boating practice as regularly beginning at 9 A.M., and the other at 2 P.M., it would surely raise doubts as to the accuracy of the information of one of them. I leave out of the question the probabilities of the case, that is, the improbability (1) that a dole, which appears to have been a substitute for a dinner, should be given in the morning; and (2) that a practical people should pay wages at the beginning and not at the end of the day. I confine myself to the difficulty raised by the difference of representation between the two writers. It is clear, I think, from a comparison of Martial X. 70, 5—14. with Juvenal I. 127 fol., that the one regards the distribution of the *sportula* in the evening, the other in the morning as a matter of course; that Martial knew nothing of a morning, Juvenal nothing

of an evening distribution. Now surely such a discrepancy as this cannot be considered unimportant. But there are other discrepancies. Juvenal represents the *sportula* as received by women. Martial knows absolutely nothing of such a custom. There is only one line (quoted by Professor Mayor in his note on Juv. I. 95) which wears even a semblance of supporting such a supposition. But in this line it seems pretty clear on careful consideration of the passage that *sportula* there signifies not the distribution, but the amount of a dole. The former signification would spoil the progress of the epigram. Again, Juvenal represents the *sportula* as received by men of high position and wealth, nobles, consuls, and rich freedmen. Of this there is no hint in Martial. Yet it is alike incredible that, if he knew of such a practice, he should not utilise it in his epigrams, and that he should not know of it, if it existed. For if he laughs at the rich and noble, as he does, for attending the morning *levées* of court favorites and generally of men more influential than themselves, he would surely laugh louder at them for receiving a dole. This fact, one may remark in passing, viz. that great men performed the *salutatio*, might suggest to one not intimately acquainted with the life of the period the inference that they received the *sportula*, which in the case of clients was so intimately connected with the *salutatio*.

Now Professor Friedländer apparently considers that these discrepancies are sufficiently accounted for by the fact that Juvenal belonged to a rather later time than Martial. But this allows an extremely small margin for a remarkable change to take place in the habits of Roman society. If the date of any of the satires may be fixed by allusions contained in them, that of the first satire cannot be later than about A.D. 100, the date of the banishment of Marius (cf. I. 49, VIII. 120). Professor Friedländer says rather vaguely that the changes alluded to probably began first after the death of Domitian. But Martial can hardly have left Rome earlier than A.D. 98, and was in constant communication with the city until he died some few years after. This leaves at most a space of five or six years for these changes to have developed in. But such changes must surely have developed gradually. If therefore the difference between the two poets in their allusions to this subject is due to difference of periods, it seems necessary to assign a date to Juvenal considerably lower than the one usually assumed. And this leads on to the whole question of the date of the author of these satires, and what evidence we have for fixing it. However, I confine myself to one difficulty here, content for the present if I can provoke an authority to solve it.—H. M. STEPHENSON.

MOMMSEN (*Röm. Gesch.* v. p. 145) says that Vespasian disbanded five of the German legions after the Batavian revolt, viz. I. Germ., IV. Maced., XVI. Gall., V. Alaud., and XV. Primig. That he disbanded the first three is almost certain. I. was probably joined with VII. Galbiana, afterwards called Gemina: IV. and XVI. were replaced by IV. Flavia Felix and XVI. Flav. Firma. But there seem to be several reasons against the disbanding of the two last. (1) Vespasian only created three new legions, the two already mentioned, and II. Adjutrix. If therefore he disbanded five, the frontiers would be left with two legions less than before. This, in view of the state of Britain, the East, Germany and the lower Danube, is very improbable. (2) The V. and XV. were the two legions besieged by Civilis in Vetera, and it was not till Vocula's final abandonment of them and the surrender of I. and XVI. that they at last gave in. Compared with the mutinous conduct

of the other legions, theirs was praiseworthy. (3) We know that one legion was annihilated by the Sarmatae under Domitian, Suet. *Dom.* 6., but with the exception of the five in question no legions are missed up to the middle of the second century (*C. I. L.* vi. 3492) except XXII. Deiot., which was never in the west, XXI. Rapax almost certainly disbanded by Domitian after the rising of Saturninus (Marqu^{dt} *Stautsw.* ii. p. 450 n. 8) and IX. Hispana in Britain. It seems therefore necessary to infer that out of these two legions, probably V. Alaud. was the one destroyed under Domitian, and replaced by I. Minervia. Grotefend (*Real-Encycl.* IV. p. 896) with much probability assigns the disbanding of XV. Prim. to Trajan.

E. G. HARDY.

ON THE WORD γλυφίδες.—The word γλυφίδας in *Il.* iv. 122 and *Od.* xxi. 419 is usually explained as the 'notch' of the arrow into which the bow-string fits. It is so explained by Hesychius s.v. in *El. Magn.* and by Eustath. on the two places in Homer, and translated 'notch' merely by all translators. Moreover, in Apoll. Rhod. iii. 282, we find γλυφίδας μέσση ἐνικάτθετο νευρῇ, where it can have no other meaning. In Homer this meaning makes fairly good sense, but that it has not been thought to be entirely satisfactory is clear from the fact that Hayman, *ad. Od. l.c.* understands it to mean 'the extremities on either side of the arrow nick'; and Merry says, 'it is not impossible that by γλυφίδας are meant some slight projections at the neck of the arrow, for the fingers of the right hand to press against in drawing the bow.' Both these interpretations have the merit of making excellent sense and explaining the plural, but the etymology of the word appears to me entirely to preclude their adoption. The word occurs again in Hdt. viii. 128, τοξεύματος παρὰ (or περὶ) τὰς γλυφίδας περιειλίζαντες καὶ πτερῶσαντες τὸ βιβλίον ἐτόξευον ἐς συγκείμενον χωρίον. Here the meaning assigned to the word in Homer does not make sense, and Schweighäuser consequently explains it to mean 'the grooves into which the feathers fitted.' He adopts περὶ for παρὰ, after Valeknär, from Aen. Taet. 31, where the story from Hdt. is quoted, and he translates (after Casaub.) 'circa sagittae crenas epistolam volventes et alas ei applicantes.' I may add that *crena* seems to be a word of uncertain meaning, and here merely represents γλυφίδας without explaining it further than as 'notch' of some sort (see L. and S. sub χηλή). Liddell and Scott, in their last edition, adopt Schweigh. 's explanation of γλυφίδες, but by a strange blunder translate περ. τὸ β. 'having made it (*i.e.* the letter) serve as feathers to the arrow,' which is not only a mistake, but an absurdity. Paley, *ad. Il. l.c.* and Eur. *Or.* 274, also adopts this explanation. It does not however suit Homer well, for there is little point in saying 'he drew the grooves for the feathers.' In Abicht's Herodotus I find a third explanation. He keeps παρὰ, the MSS. reading, and says in his note, 'near the notches at the butt end of the arrow, which served as a holding place for the fingers while drawing the string.' We should rather expect the dat. after παρὰ in this sense, but the explanation is very plausible, and is supported by Suid., who has under γλυφίδας,—τὰς χηλὰς τῆς ἀκίδος αἱ τὴν νευρὴν προσάγομεν, and by a second explanation of *El. Magn.* τὰς παρὰ τοῖς πτεροῖς ἐντομὰς τοῦ βέλους. It makes very good sense too in Homer, and as to Eur. *Or.* 274, πτερῶτὰς γλυφίδας, either of the last two meanings, or even the first (though not so well) will suit, because 'feathered notches' is clearly put by synecdoche for 'feathered arrows.' If then γλυφίδας is confined to mean some particular notch, I would

suggest this explanation, and consider that Apoll. Rhod. is here an 'ignorant imitator of Homer,' a character often assigned to him by Buttmann, and sometimes unjustly, I think. I am however informed by Mr. Cecil Smith that, as far as one can judge from sculpture and paintings, no arrow—Assyrian, Greek, or Roman—has these notches assumed by Abicht, and that certainly none of the Egyptian reed arrows at the British Museum have it. This is strong negative evidence, therefore I am rather inclined to believe that γλυφίδες, which merely means 'a carving,' may have more than one meaning, that *e.g.* it may mean notch at the end of the arrow in Homer, and grooves for the feathers (or perhaps notches at the side) in Herodotus. This is hinted at by the double explanation in *El. Magn.* and by Schweigh. himself, who says that not the *crena* 'in infima parte sagittae' is meant, but the *crena* into which the feathers were inserted. I may add that in Apoll. Rhod. iii. 218 the word occurs as a term of architecture.

R. C. SEATON.

NOTE ON Δίκαιρον.—In a pamphlet by Mr. V. Ball of Dublin (*Animals and Plants of India.* 1885.) treating of the fauna and flora described by Herodotus, Ktesias, and others, mention is made (p. 22) of the δίκαιρον, which the author with great probability identifies with the scarabaeus sacer: deriving the name from the Arabic zikairon = concealer.

Ktesias describes it as a bird, the size of a partridge's egg, which buried its dung in the earth. The Greeks commonly called it δίκαιον, an obvious corruption found in Aelian *De Nat. Anim.* iv. 41.

Is this mysterious animal the original of the still more mysterious being halēout pidikaïos = the bird Dikaïos ('avis cognomine Justa' Zoëga) which appears in the fragmentary Sahidic Acts of Andrew and Paul (printed in part by Zoëga *Catal. Codd. Copt. Vatt.*)? The Apostles send it into a city from which the Jews have excluded them, and commission it to raise a dead youth. In other respects it seems to be treated as an ordinary bird.—M. R. JAMES.

CAVILLOR.—In discussing this word in Wölfflin's *Archiv* iv. 78f, Funck says that its first sense is 'to jest,' its later meaning 'to quibble.' I venture to think that the second is the older, as it is the more special sense. The word and its connexions are rare in early Latin: all pre-Ciceronian literature seems to show only four exx, all from Plautus, viz. *Aul.* 639, *Truc.* 685, *Stich.* 226, *Miles* 641. In the first, 'aufer cavillam: non ego nunc nugis ago,' the sense of 'quibble' is by far most appropriate; the second and third passages will admit of either sense; the fourth is bracketed by Ribbeck, though not by most editors. I think that the idea of 'quibbling in jest' suits all four contexts. Festus (= Verrius) explains it exactly thus *c. est iocosa calumniatio*. The derivation is, of course, uncertain, but if the word be connected with *caveo* (as is stated in Pareus' *lexicon* and as Prof. Nettleship has lately conjectured anew), the sense of 'quibble' will come very naturally. The objection to the derivations usually given is that they do not suit the meaning. *Cavillor* always means rather mild witticism: *καβάς* (Fick) and *κόβαλος* (de Saussure *Vogelles* p. 106) denote violence, while *calvo* presents phonetic difficulties.—F. HAVERFIELD.

JOHN CLEMENT.—If we are ever to see an adequate history of classical philology in England, many hands must combine to glean from the field of letters every scattered ear. Few would look for an elaborate account of Clement, once page of Sir Thomas More, and afterwards Greek Professor at Oxford, in Teubner's

Bibliotheca. Yet there it stands, in the Preface to the Third Edition (1868) of the *Anacrontica*, by Valentine Rose.—JOHN E. B. MAYOR. [Since the above was in type two writers have spoken of Clement, Mr. Thompson Cowper in the *Diet. of National Biography*, and Prof. Rendel Harris in his book on the Leicester Codex. Neither of them is acquainted with Rose's researches.]

TO POUR OIL ON THE TROUBLED WATERS.—This proverb points to a practice which has, I believe, been lately tried with life-boats in tempestuous weather, and which was not unknown to the ancients, as we read in Pliny, *N.H.* ii. 106 (*Quem fallit*) *omne (mare) oleo tranquillari, et ob id urinantes ore spargere quoniam mitiget naturam asperam lucemque deportet?* So Plutarch (*Nat. Qu.* p. 914 F) makes it a subject of inquiry, *Διὰ τί τῆς θαλάττης ἐλαίῳ καταβραιομένης γίνεται καταφάνεια καὶ γαλήνη*; compare also his treatise, *De Primo Frigido*, p. 960. In both passages he combats Aristotle's explanation of the fact, and gives another which he considers more satisfactory. Bede must have forgotten this in his account of the miraculous preservation of Eanfleda, bride of King Oswy, from the danger of shipwreck (*H.E.* iii. 15.) St. Aidan, giving his blessing to the priest who was sent to escort her from her home in Kent, entrusted to him a flask of holy oil, which he told him would be required to still the storm on their return. So it

turned out: the vessel was on the point of sinking, when the priest bethought him of Aidan's remedy; the oil was poured out, and the sea was immediately smooth. *Sicque factum est*, is Bede's comment, *ut vir Dei et per prophetiae spiritum tempestatem praedixerit futuram, et per virtutem ejusdem spiritus hanc exortam, quamvis corporaliter absens, sopivcrit.* Bede is careful to cite his authority, and evidently regards the incident as entirely supernatural, no less so than the miracle of Germanus (*H.E.* i. 17), *qui adsumpto in nomine sanctae Trinitatis levi aquae spargine fluctus saevientes opprimit.*

May we not look upon this as a typical case? One cause of the easy acceptance of miraculous stories in the Middle Ages, was that Roman civilization was itself miraculous to the barbarian mind.

NOTE ON C. R. I p. 192 col. i.—Mr. Margoliouth writes: 'A story very similar to that quoted by you is to be found on p. 154 of the *Vulgar Arabic Grammar* of Caussin de Perceval ed. 5, with some variation in the numbers and the *mise-en-scène*. Caussin does not state from what book he obtained the Arabic text, but the story is Eastern enough.'

Mr. Stout, Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, refers me to Grimm's *Märchen* No. 7 with the notes.

The exact story will probably be found in some Italian or French collection of tales.—J. E. B. M.

CLASSICAL EDUCATION IN FRANCE.

(Letter from a French University Professor.)

II.

Il existe dans les lycées des examens de passage d'une classe à l'autre. Ces examens deviennent plus sérieux d'année en année, et d'après les circulaires ministérielles doivent continuer à le devenir de plus en plus; ce qui prouve qu'ils ne le sont pas encore au plus haut degré. Il y a pourtant chaque année un certain nombre d'élèves refusés à l'entrée de différentes classes; il y en a même qu'on fait redescendre dans le courant du premier trimestre. Un examen plus important que les autres a lieu au sortir de la 4^e. C'est ce qu'on appelle l'examen de grammaire. Il faut l'avoir subi avec succès pour entrer dans la division supérieure du lycée et aussi dans certaines écoles. Entre la classe de Rhétorique et celle de Philosophie, le lycée ne fait pas subir d'examen à ses élèves. Ils vont se présenter devant la Faculté des lettres, et alors commencent les examens vraiment importants et qu'on n'affronte pas sans émotion. Essayons de les caractériser rapidement.

Le premier est un examen qui se passe en deux fois, à un an d'intervalle. Au sortir de la Rhétorique, on subit une première série d'épreuves, après la Philosophie, une autre série. Le candidat qui a subi avec succès les unes et les autres obtient le titre de bachelier ès lettres. Ce titre est la condition de l'admission dans les Facultés, dans certaines écoles du gouvernement, et enfin dans une multitude de carrières diverses, sans parler du volontariat dans l'armée, pour lequel le baccalauréat dispense de l'examen spécial. Aussi se fait-il chaque année des milliers de bacheliers dans toute la France. Il y a des Facultés qui voient en une année se présenter devant elles plus

de mille candidats pour la première partie, un peu moins pour la seconde. Deux tiers environ des candidats sont ajournés à la première partie, la moitié à la seconde. La plupart reviennent à la charge jusqu'à ce qu'ils réussissent. La première partie de l'examen du baccalauréat consiste en trois épreuves écrites et plusieurs orales; composition française, version latine, et thème allemand ou anglais; interrogations sur le latin, le grec, le français, l'allemand ou l'anglais, l'histoire et la géographie, l'histoire littéraire. Le sujet de la composition française est tantôt historique, tantôt littéraire. La version latine est tirée de Cicéron, de Quintilien, quelquefois de Tacite ou de Lucrece, etc., mais autant que possible d'un des ouvrages qu'on ne lit pas communément dans les classes. On n'est admis à se présenter aux épreuves orales que si les trois compositions sont passables. La plupart des échecs sont attribuables aux épreuves écrites. Les épreuves orales de latin et de grec portent sur les auteurs qu'on étudie dans la division supérieure du lycée. Chaque candidat indique six ouvrages de chaque langue, parmi lesquels l'examineur choisit. Comme on est pressé, à cause du grand nombre des candidats, ces interrogations se bornent le plus souvent à faire traduire quelques lignes; tout au plus y ajoutera-t-on deux ou trois questions sur des temps de verbes en grec, sur un détail de grammaire ou d'antiquités en latin. Les bons élèves des lycées s'en tirent fort bien en général, quelques-uns d'une manière brillante; mais la différence entre les dix premiers d'une classe et les dix derniers est très forte. Cela vient de ce que les élèves faibles n'ont pas été éliminés avec assez de fermeté des classes où leur insuffisance a commencé

à se faire sentir. Il faut avouer enfin que les meilleurs même baissent d'année en année. A la seconde partie du baccalauréat les études classiques ne sont pas plus représentées que dans l'enseignement de la classe de Philosophie. Les candidats peuvent être interrogés sur certains livres désignés à l'avance, de Platon, Aristote, Cicéron, &c., dans la langue originale. Mais les examinateurs insistent peu sur ce point. Aussi le bachelier en lettres sait-il beaucoup moins de grec et de latin que l'élève de Rhétorique. Il a passé une année à oublier ces langues.

Le baccalauréat est le premier grade universitaire, la licence en lettres le second, le doctorat le troisième. Ce dernier est exigé de ceux qui se destinent à l'enseignement supérieur. Entre la licence et le doctorat se place ordinairement l'agrégation des lettres ou de grammaire, qui donne droit à être professeur dans un lycée. Le titre de licencié suffit pour être nommé professeur dans les collèges, ou chargé de cours dans les lycées. Quelques-uns le recherchent aussi comme titre honorifique. Il y a quatre ordres de licence en lettres : la licence philosophique, historique, licence des langues vivantes, et enfin la licence en lettres proprement dite. C'est cette dernière qui doit surtout vous intéresser. Les autres n'en diffèrent d'ailleurs que par certaines épreuves spéciales destinées à établir la capacité du candidat à enseigner la philosophie, l'histoire ou les langues vivantes.

Les épreuves écrites de la licence sont : une composition française et une latine, un thème grec, une composition de grammaire et de métrique ; enfin quelques épreuves facultatives et ne pouvant exercer qu'une faible influence, mais toujours favorable, sur le résultat. Elles ont pour sujet des matières non comprises dans le programme ordinaire, comme par exemple, les langues romanes, et particulièrement les vers latins, dont c'est ici le dernier refuge. Une des gloires de l'Université, il y a trente ans encore, les vers latins sont tombés si bas, que c'est à peine si 12 ou 15 % des candidats usent du droit qu'ils ont d'en présenter. La composition latine a généralement pour sujet une question de critique littéraire : l'intervention des dieux dans l'*Énéide*, le jugement d'Horace sur les anciens poètes, l'art dramatique dans tel dialogue de Platon, ou quelque autre banalité de ce genre, qui puisse se traiter en 6 heures à huis clos. Les examinateurs se voient de plus en plus forcés de juger principalement d'après le style, ce qui n'a pas grand inconvénient, puisque la composition française est là pour montrer si le candidat a des idées, s'il sait les disposer et les exposer. Dans la composition latine, il s'agit surtout de s'assurer qu'il manie le latin sans trop de peine, qu'il en a assez l'habitude pour ne pas laisser échapper des incorrections trop graves, en un mot, qu'il sera capable de diriger les exercices latins de sa classe. Le thème grec est l'épreuve la plus redoutée. On ne peut pas être extrêmement exigeant envers des candidats qui n'ont guère commencé à traduire en grec qu'après avoir achevé leurs études secondaires ; mais on cherche à relever le niveau en se montrant sévère pour les incorrections et en demandant même que le grec de ces thèmes ne soit pas trop français. La grammaire et la métrique forment ensemble une seule épreuve. Les sujets sont forcément très élémentaires, parce que le candidat, travaillant à huis clos, doivent tout tirer de leurs souvenirs et de leurs réflexions du moment. C'est ou bien une question de morphologie à élucider, ou bien un chapitre de syntaxe à exposer, ou encore quelques lignes de texte à commenter ; et pour la métrique, soit des vers à scander, soit la structure de telle ou telle sorte de vers à indiquer. Le programme d'ailleurs ne va pas au-delà des mètres d'Horace. Des tragiques grecs, de l'indare, pas question.

Les candidats dont les compositions ont été jugées passables sont admis à l'examen oral, qui consiste principalement dans l'explication de fragments d'auteurs grecs, latins et français, pris dans un certain nombre d'ouvrages désignés à l'avance par le ministre. En outre, il leur est adressé une série de questions sur l'histoire des trois littératures dites classiques, sur les institutions grecques et romaines ; enfin ils ont à justifier d'une connaissance suffisante de l'allemand ou de l'anglais pour se servir de livres écrits en une de ces langues. En somme, c'est un examen d'études secondaires. On peut le subir avec éclat sans s'être jamais essayé à aucune recherche personnelle, sans s'être servi d'ouvrages de première main sur aucun sujet, sans savoir même ce que c'est que la science de l'antiquité. Il suffit, avec un esprit ouvert et quelques dispositions, d'avoir subi un certain entraînement pour la composition, d'avoir fait des lectures accessibles à toute personne un peu cultivée, et d'avoir préparé avec soin les auteurs du programme. Cependant il faut croire que nous sommes menacés d'un excès d'érudition chez nos jeunes professeurs, puisque des circulaires ministérielles recommandent avec insistance de ne rien demander aux candidats qui sorte du cercle des connaissances générales.

Une fois licencié en lettres, on peut se présenter à l'agrégation. Encore ici il y a plusieurs catégories. Celles qui vous intéressent sont l'agrégation de grammaire et l'agrégation des lettres. L'agrégation n'est pas un grade que les Facultés confèrent ; celles-ci n'ont pas à s'en occuper ; elle est au concours. Chaque année le ministre fixe d'avance le nombre de candidats à recevoir, une vingtaine ou une trentaine, par exemple ; un jury nommé par le ministre classe les candidats, plus de 150 quelquefois, et les premiers en rang sont reçus jusqu'à concurrence du nombre fixé. Ce système a l'avantage de stimuler beaucoup les candidats, puisque le niveau qu'il faut atteindre n'est pas connu d'avance, et qu'on peut toujours espérer, à force de travail, de surpasser ses concurrents. Mais il a de grands inconvénients aussi. Il implique l'unité de jury, l'unité de session, l'unité de programme pour chaque ordre d'agrégation, et par conséquent une uniformité dans les études préparatoires qui n'est certes pas faite pour développer l'esprit d'investigation et pour faire naître les vocations scientifiques. Pour comparer équitablement entre eux 150 jeunes gens, on ne peut examiner chacun sur ce qui l'intéresse et ce qu'il a étudié par goût. Où serait l'unité de mesure ? Combien trouverait-on d'examineurs capables de passer, pendant 15 ou 20 jours de suite, d'un sujet à l'autre, avec des candidats spécialement préparés sur chacun ? Il est inévitable aussi qu'un seul jury en présence de tant de candidats ne soit pas un peu pressé par le temps. Certains candidats des mieux notés rapportent l'impression d'un défilé bien rapide. J'en connais un, reçu second du premier coup, qui a coutume d'appeler l'agrégation un baccalauréat supérieur. Et il est bien vrai, que, à l'agrégation comme à la licence, les épreuves les plus importantes sont des exercices d'écoliers, thèmes, versions, compositions à huis clos, rien qui permette de juger de ce que sera le travail de l'homme fait, du professeur. La leçon et l'explication préparée sont les seules épreuves utiles à cet égard. Mais c'en sont deux sur neuf ou dix, et l'on n'y est admis qu'après avoir réussi aux autres. Il est vrai que l'agrégation est destinée à recruter le personnel de l'enseignement secondaire, et non celui des Facultés. Mais ce ne sera jamais qu'un enseignement médiocre que celui dont les représentants n'auront pas tout au moins goûté du fruit de l'arbre de la science. Les épreuves écrites de l'agrégation sont à peu près les

mêmes que pour la licence, si ce n'est qu'il s'y ajoute une version latine et une version de langue vivante, et qu'à l'agrégation de grammaire la dissertation latine est remplacée par un thème latin. La partie orale comprend une explication de texte dans chacune des trois langues classiques ; une seconde explication, plus approfondie, après 24 heures de préparation, d'un texte grec ou latin : enfin une leçon sur un sujet littéraire ou historique. On peut se présenter au concours d'agrégation indéfiniment, et il est rare d'être reçu la première fois. Il n'y a que peu de différence entre les programmes de l'agrégation des lettres et de l'agrégation de grammaire. Les deux jurys et leur manière d'apprécier se ressemblent beaucoup moins.

Le doctorat ès-lettres est conféré par les Facultés des lettres, en principe. En réalité, c'est la Faculté de Paris seule qui confère le véritable doctorat, celui qui ouvre les portes de l'enseignement supérieur. On ne se présente devant les Facultés de province que pour l'honneur. Pour obtenir le doctorat, on n'a pas d'examen à subir. On écrit deux thèses, une française, qui est souvent un gros livre, et une latine, moins

volumineuse. Ces thèses sont lues par un membre de la Faculté, puis imprimées, si elles sont acceptées ; enfin, on est appelé à les soutenir, en séance publique, devant un jury dont les membres, au nombre de six au moins, les critiquent successivement.

Ainsi se clôt la série des épreuves que trouvent échelonnées sur leur route ceux qui se destinent en France à l'enseignement classique, soit secondaire, soit supérieur. Vous vous étiez demandé peut-être pourquoi je plaçais ma lettre sur les examens entre les deux qui parlent d'enseignement. Vous voyez maintenant que je me souvenais de votre question : *how far the instruction given at college is distinct from that given at school*. On ne peut guère déterminer la différence qui existe entre l'enseignement secondaire et l'enseignement supérieur, sans comparer le baccalauréat à la licence et à l'agrégation. L'examen placé à la fin d'une période d'études finit toujours, dans une certaine mesure, par en fixer le caractère. Connaissant les examens entre lesquels les études classiques d'ordre supérieur se trouvent encadrées, vous devinez déjà jusqu'à un certain point ce qu'elles doivent être.

(To be continued.)

UNIVERSITY INTELLIGENCE.

TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN.

TRINITY MONDAY, 1887.

THIS is Election Day for Fellows and Scholars. Our new Fellow is Mr. John Isaac Beare, First Scholar in Classics, 1878, First Senior Moderator in Classics, Fourth Senior Moderator in Logics and Ethics, and University Student, 1879. Seven Classical Scholars of the House were elected.

I promised in my May letter to give some account of the other Classical Schools in Ireland and of the Trinity College men who are connected with them. The Queen's Colleges at Belfast, Cork and Galway were founded in 1849, and incorporated in 1851 into the Queen's University. In 1882 the Queen's University was dissolved in order to make room for the Royal University. The difference between the two institutions is that the Queen's University consisted of the three Queen's Colleges only, and none but students matriculated at a Queen's College could become graduates of Queen's University ; but the Royal University is open to all comers, whether they have or have not matriculated at a Queen's College or at any College. The Queen's Colleges continue to subsist, until some new political move shall bring them down like the University called after them ; but the political aspect of matters cannot be treated in these pages, though it is an unfortunate fact that political and sectarian considerations keep cropping up in the most unexpected places in Irish educational history. To return to our own proper subject ; the professorial staff of the Queen's Colleges has been all along recruited, almost without exception, from Trinity College, Dublin. At present the Professor of Greek at Belfast, Mr. Hastings Crossley, the Professor of Greek at Cork, Mr. William Ridgeway, and the Professor of Latin at Galway, Mr. John Fletcher Davies, are all Trinity College men. Mr. Crossley entered in 1864 and became a Scholar of the House in 1865. He was First Senior Moderator in Classics,

and Second Senior Moderator in Logics and Ethics in 1868. He was a candidate for Fellowship in 1870 and 1871, and obtained a prize each time, but ultimately retired from the contest and accepted the Belfast Professorship, to which he was appointed in 1878. Mr. Crossley has published "Saul," a Vice-Chancellor's prize poem ; also an edition of Book I. of the works of Marcus Aurelius. He is completing this edition, we understand, in collaboration with Mr. Lindsay, of Jesus College, Oxford. Mr. Crossley contributed largely to *Dublin Translations*.

Mr. William Ridgeway became a Scholar of the House in 1873 (having for contemporaries Mr. Louis Claude Purser, now Fellow, and Mr. Oscar Wilde). In 1875 he was second Senior Moderator in Classics and first Senior Moderator in Modern Literature. Subsequently he went to Cambridge and became a Fellow of Caius. He was appointed to the Greek Chair at Cork in succession to Mr. Vaughan Boulger (another Trinity College man) in 1884. Mr. Ridgeway's published work has chiefly consisted of contributions to learned journals.

Mr. John Fletcher Davies was a Scholar of the House as long ago as 1858, and was a Senior Moderator in Classics in 1859. After taking his degree he became head Classical master of Kingstown School, which although a private and an endowed institution has perhaps sent out as many brilliant men as any other school in Ireland, especially during Mr. Davies' time. He retired in 1878, and for two years lived principally in England. In 1880, when Dr. Maguire gave up the Chair of Latin in Galway on becoming a Fellow, it was offered to Mr. Davies and accepted by him. Mr. Davies' chief works are his editions of *Choephoroë*, *Agamemnon*, and *Eumenides*. Scholars have differed as to the value of these editions, but whatever may be the opinion formed as to the audacity of the commentator, nobody will deny him the praise of a

brilliancy amounting to genius. It is next to impossible to read Mr. Davies' work, and wholly impossible to hold converse with him, without feeling the presence of a quite unique mind. Whatever one may think of his views on particular points, one is compelled to feel that the enthusiasm of scholarship is in the man, to a degree hardly ever paralleled. This is the secret of his influence with his pupils, an influence in which he may be said to be unrivalled among teachers, in Ireland at any rate.

The Professors of Latin at Belfast and Cork, and of Greek at Galway, are Oxford or Cambridge men.

There are no Colleges, strictly speaking, affiliated to the Royal University, unless the Queen's Colleges may be said to be so. The relation of the Royal

University to the various independent schools and colleges of Ireland is rather anomalous. The endowed schools and colleges of royal foundation throughout Ireland send their pupils to Trinity College rather than to the Royal University; and so do the Erasmus Smith schools, and others endowed in time past by private founders. The Royal University, therefore, is chiefly recruited from the various Roman Catholic seminaries throughout the island, and it is impracticable to say anything of their staff or their system, except that the staff is not recruited from Trinity College, Dublin.

Not to trespass too much on your space, I reserve for a future letter some account of our curriculum and methods of study.

(For Examinations see page 3 of Wrapper.)

ARCHÆOLOGY.

BRITISH MUSEUM CATALOGUE OF GREEK COINS.

The Peloponnesus. Edited by PERCY GARDNER.
D. Litt. Lond. 1887.

THIS summer the *British Museum Coin Catalogue* has advanced one stage farther on the way to completion. Its new volume is, we are sorry to say, the last of the series which will be edited by Professor Gardner, who has just relinquished his post at the Museum in order to go into residence at Oxford as Merton Professor of Classical Archaeology. Geographically speaking we are now brought down to the end of the issues of European Greece, if we except the long-promised volume on Athens and Corinth, which still shows no signs of appearing.

From the numismatist's point of view the Peloponnesus abounds in problems. First and foremost of them is the extraordinary dearth of sixth-century coins in the whole district. With the exception of Corinth, Heraea, and possibly Sicyon, none of its towns seem to have issued money before B.C. 500. Nothing can be stranger than that cities of the first rank like Argos, and great and wealthy religious centres like Elis, should have had no currency at a time when every small town in Asia Minor was accustomed to strike its own coins, and when in Northern Greece comparatively poor states, such as Phœnis, had commenced their issues. It is not impossible that archaic coins of additional Peloponnesian towns may some day be discovered, but at present the attributions made to Pheneus, Philius, and other places of early coins with rude incuse reverses are inadmissible: the British Museum wisely classes the coins in question as 'European, Uncertain,' and their fabric seems to point to Thracian and Macedonian rather than Peloponnesian localities. The only explanation of the dearth of issues in Southern Greece is the predominance of the Aeginetan stater, which, as we know from the evidence of inscriptions, was received as the ordinary circulating medium as late as the times of the Peloponnesian war. Taking this hint, we may ascribe the commencement of the issues of Argos, Mantinea, Troezen, Elis, and other cities whose coinage dates from the early years of the fifth century, to the cutting short of the commercial supremacy of Aegina by her first wars with Athens. But even then it remains a problem why the not very important town of Heraea

should have begun to strike money some fifty years before her richer and more powerful neighbours.

The next point of note in the coinage of the Peloponnesus is the appearance of a long series of half-drachms and obols bearing the inscription ΑΡΚΑΔΙΚΟΝ, which from the evidence of style must be ascribed to the period between the Persian wars and the battle of Mantinea (B.C. 480-417). These pieces should by rights imply the existence of an Arcadian league, and their main type, the figure of Zeus, is the one which we should expect to be chosen for a national coinage. But, on the other hand, we have no historical evidence in favour of any confederation, and the Spartan hegemony in the Peloponnesus was always used to prevent the formation of alliances between the smaller states. It is true that in spite of this the Arcadians strove to combine; in *Herod.* ix. 35, for example, we read of an occasion on which every state in the country save Mantinea joined in an attempt to throw off the Spartan yoke. But such alliances were too ephemeral to produce a coinage which on the lowest estimate must have covered forty years, and may well have extended to sixty. Moreover, there are numerous coins of Arcadian towns which are contemporary with these federal issues: Tegea, Cleitor, Psophis, Mantinea, and possibly several other places having struck money between 480 and 417 B.C. The existence therefore of the ΑΡΚΑΔΙΚΟΝ series places us in a dilemma: either some one town issued pieces which purported to be national and not local, or else—contrary to all historic evidence and probability—some sort of Arcadian league must have lasted on during the greater part of the fifth century. Professor Gardner inclines to the former alternative, and pitches on Heraea as the place of issue, induced by the fact that it was the only Arcadian town which was already possessed of a mint, and by the style of the seated Zeus on the coins, which is not unlike that of some early pieces of Heraea's great neighbour, Elis. That a single town should claim to strike money in behalf of a whole nation is not quite unparallelled: at any rate Tanagra struck coins in the name of the Boeotians in the period 480-470, indicating her individuality only by a T modestly concealed in an obscure part of the coin. Nevertheless, we cannot bring ourselves to accept the conclusion at which Professor Gardner and Dr. Imhoof Blumer have

arrived. Heraea had never any pretensions to a precedence among Arcadian towns; Trapezus was the old site of the kings when the country was still united, while in historical times Mantinea and Tegea were the most important places. Arcadia was usually divided between a philo-Laconian and an anti-Laconian party, but in neither of the factions was Heraea the leading town. Neither was it in any way the religious centre of the nation, for that was undoubtedly to be found in the sanctuary of Zeus Lycaeus in the territory of Lycosura. Moreover the idea that the ΑΡΚΑΔΙΚΟΝ coins are a mere continuation of the earlier Heraean series is not entirely borne out by the evidence of style. In fabric as well as in artistic treatment there is a very considerable gap between the last coins of the town and the first of the federal series, while, on the other hand, it would not be impossible to contend that the first of the new series of Heraean issues which Professor Gardner ascribes to the period B.C. 417-370 overlap the last of the Federal coins, the work of which is quite compatible with the concluding years of the fifth century, while their incuse square on the reverse is barely visible. On the whole then we should be inclined to believe, with Mr. Head and Professor Curtius, in the existence of an Arcadian league which persisted throughout the fifth century, although many important towns may have stood aloof from it at various epochs. And if a locality must be found for its mint, the great national sanctuary on Mount Lycaean certainly appears the most natural site.

Turning on to other questions, we are glad to see that Professor Gardner has a word to say in favour of the famous Spartan iron money, whose existence has been so firmly denied. Certainly if, as he says, iron money of Tegea and Argos has been lately discovered, there is not the least reason to doubt the concurrent testimony of tradition as to the persistence of an iron currency at conservative Sparta down to the fourth century. The large Lacedaemonian silver coin with the head of a king, which used to be ascribed to Antigonus Doson's occupation of Sparta after his victory at Sellasia, is moved forward half a century and given to King Areus, of whom the Berlin Museum possesses another tetradrachm, of Alexandrine type, with the unmistakable inscription, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΡΕΟΣ. This identification is certainly very superior to that of M. Bompais, who started the notion that the head was that of Antigonus.

There are one or two attributions in this volume which we should regard as not quite so likely as the last-mentioned one. The Obols ascribed to Parorceia should almost certainly be given to the Parrhasians; the Achaian league coins with a trident and the monogram KA are in all probability merely a variety of the coinage of Troezen, not the issues of the town of Ceryneia. It is difficult to see how Dr. Weil, who first started this theory, came to entertain the view. The two small 'uncertain' coins at the end of the volume probably belong to Troezen; the Paris collection owns a drachm whose main type is an archaic female head, full face, exactly similar to these pieces.

This book contains the usual lavish allowance of beautiful autotype plates which the Museum publications display, and is in all respects equal to the rest of this magnificent series of volumes.

C. W. C. OMAN.

Rhodes in Modern Times, by CECIL TORR (Cambridge University Press, 1887), is a continuation of the history of that island, the classical portion of which was contained in the author's previous work, *Rhodes in Ancient Times*. The mediaeval history down to the Ottoman

conquest in 1522 is here given continuously for the first time, and with a view to it the original sources have been conscientiously examined. The task was not a light one, because of the length of the period embraced in the survey, and the obscurity of many of the facts brought to light, which required to be carefully criticised. Only a few of the events included in it come within the scope of this Review. In an enumeration of the earthquakes by which Rhodes has been visited, we learn that the city, after having been destroyed owing to this cause in 227 B.C., and again in 157 A.D., was ruined for the third time in 515 A.D., in the reign of Anastasius I. That emperor made a large grant towards the rebuilding, but neither he nor the Rhodians themselves were in a position to rebuild the place on its former scale; so that it seems to have been at that time that the ancient line of the city walls, which enclosed over a thousand acres, was exchanged for the modern line, which encloses less than a hundred and fifty. Mr. Torr has examined with much acuteness the various stories which grew up around the Colossus of Rhodes. Some of these—for instance, that after it had fallen it was set up again by Vespasian; that in Hadrian's time it was moved; that it was gilt, and 120 feet in height,—arose from its being confused with the colossal statue of Nero at Rome. Other mistakes were caused by the word *στήλη* being applied to it in some accounts in its later meaning 'a statue', and this being confused with the earlier meaning 'a column'. Hence one writer about 300 A.D. describes the Colossus as a marble column a hundred cubits in height, another about 1000 A.D. states that it was a column of bronze a thousand cubits in height; and the stone obelisk in the Meidan at Constantinople was compared in an inscription of the eleventh century upon its base to the Colossus of Rhodes. Again, in allusion to the Colossus, the Rhodians were known among the Byzantine Greeks as *Κολοσσαῖς*, and afterwards the official style of the Latin archbishops of Rhodes was *Archiepiscopus Colossensis*. Hence Sir John Maundeville remarks, that St. Paul wrote an epistle to the inhabitants of that island, *ad Colossenses*. Another curious fact which we learn from this volume relates to the ceramic art in antiquity. It is well known with regard to the plates of the Rhodian ware of the time of the occupation of the island by the Knights of St. John, which are so highly prized by collectors, that they were intended, not for use, but for suspension against walls as ornaments; and even at the present day, when the peasants throughout the island, in whose cottages these treasures were found, have parted with them, their places have been taken by common modern plates, which are hung in the same manner—sometimes to the number of seventy in one room. With a view to this decorative use, the mediaeval plates of this ware were always pierced with two holes for suspension. Now Mr. Torr informs us, that the earliest dishes from Camiros, dating from about 700 B.C., are pierced in just the same way.

H. F. T.

ACQUISITIONS OF BRITISH MUSEUM.

Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities.

A kriophoros; and a seated ram: both in terracotta, from Beyrût.

A terra-cotta statuette of Eros leaning on a term: from Babylonia.

Mr. W. R. Paton has presented the Carpathos vases noted in Loeschke and Fürtwaengler *Myk. Vas.* p. 83: the Assarlik antiquities mentioned *ante* p. 81, and *Hellenic Journal* viii. 64—82: and three more vases of the 'Mycenæan' type, found near Pothia in

Kalyinna, lower down the hill than those found last year.

A jet panel, with relief of a figure standing with uplifted arms in a ship manned by three rowers (Odysseus mocking the Cyclops ?)

Two terra-cotta masks, from Tartus : and a leaden Eros in low relief, from Beyrât.

A green jasper intaglio, with Indo-Greek designs.

A gold chain terminating at one end in a lion's head with the Herculean knot : at the other, in a lion's head, with a ring : from Cyprus.

A bronze Etruscan figure of a running female on a flower, probably one of the supports of a cista ; she wears the tutulus, and raises her mantle with the left hand : from Todi.

A fine series of twenty-six moulds for terra-cotta figures : from Tarentum.

A lekythos with Maenad (?) rushing to right, looking back and holding out a chelys in her left hand : the flesh is coloured white, the hair buff, the chelys buff with white outline, the drapery left with incised outline on the black glaze : from Tarentum : cf. Sammlung Sabouloff, pl. liv., 1.

Large hydria with friezes of warriors, horsemen, &c., in so-called Chalcidian style : from Cervetri.

Small oblong plaque of bronze with portions of two panels ranged vertically one above the other ; within each panel is incised a pair of nude figures, possibly athletes ; the style is somewhat rough, apparently a late imitation of an archaic design similar to those in *Ausgrabungen zu Olympia*, vol. iv. pp. 18—19 : found in the Tiber, 1887.

Small portrait-head of an old man, in marble.

Cecil Smith.

THE SCARABÆUS FROM IALYSOS.—The fact that a scarabæus with a cartouch of Amenhotep III (about 1500 B.C.) was found at Ialysos in Rhodes in a tomb-chamber containing antiquities of the Mycenaean period has been adduced as proof of the early date of these antiquities. This fact is obviously no proof of their early date, for an object like a scarabæus might be treasured for centuries before interment ; but it is, on the other hand, a striking proof of their comparatively late date. The majority of extant scarabæi with cartouches of kings of the Old or the Middle or the New Empire belong to the 'Early Egyptian Revival,' which began with the Twenty-Sixth Dynasty (from 666 B.C. onwards), and these can always be readily distinguished from the contemporary scarabæi of those early kings by certain broad differences of style and of workmanship. There cannot be the slightest doubt that this scarabæus from Ialysos—which is now in Table Case B in the First Vase-room in the British Museum—belongs to the Revival. The fact that it was found in that tomb-chamber at Ialysos is therefore a proof, not that the antiquities found with it are little (if at all) later than the Fifteenth Century, but that they are little (if at all) earlier than the Seventh. I have pointed this out before, but venture to point it out again, as the old argument is restated in some recent publications on Homer.—Cecil Torr.

IN the 'Εφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογική, 1887, p. 50, Koumanoudes publishes a woodcut of a disk of Pentelic marble, diam. 1·22 metre, which he thus describes : 'Εφ' ὅσον σώζεται, εἶναι τὸ τρίτον περίπου μέρος δίσκου (ἢ τυπαρίου τυροῦ μεγάλου) . . . ἔχοντος ἐπὶ τῆς ἐτέρας τῶν ὀριζοντιῶν τοῦ ἐπιφανείῳ ἀνάγλυπτον κόσμον ἀστεροειδῆ, σχηματιζόμενον ἐκ φύλλων δάφνης, μεταξύ δ' αὐτῶν τρύματα κυκλωτερῆ, περὶ δὲ τὴν ἀντιγὰ γράμματα ἐγκεχαραγμένα κ.τ.λ.

The learned professor hesitates about his explanation, but is inclined to think the 'disk' formed part of a well or fountain, and that the inscription indicated the number of stadia from which the water was drawn.

I think he has rather missed the point. If we imagine the monument restored to its original condition (for which the existing portion gives sufficient data), we obtain an unmistakable *wheel*, such as is the most usual shape employed, *e.g.* on vase pictures of the fourth century. It consists of a thick felly with four spokes in the form of elongated myrtle leaves : to strengthen these spokes the angles between them and the felly are filled in, so that the spoke is only left free close around the nave : the general view being that of a four-leaved shamrock, the leaves of which represent the empty portions ; a form both decorative and obviously most suitable for execution in stone or marble where the spokes would require to be as strong as possible.

The inscription, which as usual upon dedicated wheels¹ runs around the felly, is as follows

... ΣΣΤΑΔΙΩΝΒ...

Considering that it was found in the Olympieion I think we are justified in restoring ὕπο[s] σταδίων τὸ β. If so, the wheel was probably one (the second) of a series of marks set up to delimitate the course of the stadia in the games : this restoration would just cover that portion of the wheel where it would be easily readable in a vertical position.

The remaining slabs of marble found together with this may have formed part of the plinth on which it rested. I am not aware that we have any record of the use of a wheel in this connection : but the single wheel was familiar enough in Greek art, especially in the typical agonistic myth of Pelops and Oinomaos, and I see no reason why this should not have been employed as a distinction from the ordinary goal-post.—Cecil Smith.

Les Musées d'Athènes. Parts 1 and 2. Athens : Karl Wilberg. Fr. 7.50, per part.

Each part of this publication is to contain eight prototype plates by Rhomaides Brothers, nine inches by six without the margin, and short explanatory text in Greek, German, French and English. In the first part the text is by Cavvadias ; and by Sophoulis in the second. The plates might be better artistically : but they are good enough for almost all purposes, and they certainly are very cheap. The first shows the portion of the excavations on the Acropolis, to the left of the path from the Propylea to the Erechtheion, where the archaic marble statues were found in February 1886. Ten plates are devoted to these marble statues. Another represents the Hermes Moscophoros in the Acropolis Museum, for comparison with these. Two others represent two marble heads of somewhat later date, found on the Acropolis in 1882 ; and the remaining two a bronze head found there in 1882 and another found there in 1886 : these last in two aspects each. Altogether, the publication is meritorious and deserving of support.—C. T.

Antike Denkmäler, herausgegeben vom Kaiserlich Deutschen Archäologischen Institut. Band I : erstes Heft. Berlin : Verlag von Georg Reimer. 40 Mk.

This publication replaces the *Monumenti Inediti* so long published in Rome ; the *Annali* being at the

¹ See Newton, *Ancient Greek Inscriptions*, No. 133 ; and Carapanos, *Dodone*, pl. xxvi. 1, p. 47.

same time merged, together with the *Archäologische Zeitung*, in the new *Jahrbuch*. It is intended to appear yearly and to consist as a rule of twelve folio plates, with short explanatory text, in a portfolio. In the part before us the explanatory text is far too short. For example, the first two plates (exhibiting the newly-found Peisistratid temple of Athene on the Acropolis) depend on an article of 14 pages by Dörpfeld in the corresponding number of the *Athenische Mittheilungen*. The substance of this article should have been given with the plates: or at any rate, something more than a little note of thirty lines. These two plates are very satisfactory, including a detailed plan of the foundations in their present condition, a restoration of the front and some architectural members, and also a plan showing the position of this temple and of the Erechtheion and of the Parthenon of Cimon and the Parthenon of Pericles. Two other plates illustrate the later Parthenon by the reproduction of the drawings of the east and west fronts made before the explosion by Carrey and by the unknown artist employed by Nointel. Laborde's rendering of Carrey's drawings is slightly better than this; but his book is scarce, and he does not give the drawings made for Nointel; and the rendering of both sets by Michaelis is far inferior to that before us. Another plate represents in profile and in full face a marble head belonging to a copy of the Athene Parthenos, found in Rome and now in Berlin. It seems minutely accurate; and gives the goddess a far more youthful and mobile face than the other copies yet known. The plate is excellent; the surface of the marble and the remains of colour upon it being rendered in very delicate tints. Equally excellent in their way are the two plates of two of the bronze statues found in Rome the winter before last, the seated boxer and the standing portrait statue of a young man—the latter in two aspects, from left and right. The play of light and shade on the bronze is admirably rendered. But the coloured plate of a Roman fresco of trees and birds is less successful, looking somewhat stiff and heavy and suggesting excessive restoration. All these plates are well suited to such a publication: but it is not easy to see why two plates should be given up to two vases with the signature of Sosias. Both of them have been published before, one of them in the *Monumenti* themselves: and if any further publication were necessary, it had better have been reserved for the *Wiener Vorlegeblätter*. Nor is it easy to see why two more of these large plates should be given up to fifty-four little votive tablets, which had better have been published two or three to the page in an ordinary volume. Not that they are uninteresting in themselves: they illustrate a style of painting otherwise known only from the black-figured vases: and their publication in any form is a matter for congratulation in this country inasmuch as, although such tablets were bought by the hundred for the Berlin Museum and the Louvre after their discovery at Corinth in 1879, not a single specimen was obtained for the British Museum. The same objection may be taken to the remaining plate, which contains twenty-nine pieces of jewelry nearly all found in Ithaca: though these certainly form a graceful group and are skilfully etched. But although a praiseworthy desire to make this publication representative of the various branches of classical archaeology has brought about the inclusion of several unsuitable subjects, this does not seriously diminish its merit as a whole. And it would be well if it were better known in this country: for a perception of the excellence of these illustrations of pieces of sculpture in various aspects and in colour

might do something towards the suppression of the prevalent mania for plaster casts, which are in truth costly and cumbersome and destructive of all sense for beauty.—C. T.

Archäologisches Jahrbuch. 1887: part 2. Berlin.

1. Mayer on a marble group in the Villa Borghese of an Amazon riding down two warriors, probably inspired by the Pergamene Amazonomachia on the Acropolis: plate. 2. Dümmler on the early silver girdle with reliefs, found at Poli-tis-Chrysokou in Cyprus and now in the British Museum: plate. 3. Hauser shows that the bronze statuette at Tübingen, published in the last volume by Schwabe as a charioteer, really represents a runner in the Hoplitodromos. 4. Löwy on two reliefs in the Villa Albani. 5. Heydemann on vase-paintings representing Seilenos before Midas. 6. Wernicke on some representations of the Triton of Tanagra. 7. Köpp on the origin of high-relief among the Greeks. 8. Heydemann argues from a vase in the Museum at Naples that the statue there commonly called Aphrodite Kallipygos really represents an Hetera. 9. Schmidt on a relief in the Villa Albani.—C. T.

Athenische Mittheilungen. 1887: parts 1 and 2. Athens.

1. Dümmler and Studniczka argue, in opposition to Furtwängler and Löschke, that the antiquities from Mycenæ are Carian in origin, and not Achaean: Studniczka relying mainly on the absence of fibulae. 2. Dörpfeld discusses numerous passages from ancient authors and inscriptions in support of his view that the cella of the ancient temple of Athene on the Acropolis was rebuilt, without the peristyle, after the Persian wars and was still standing alongside the Erechtheion in the time of Pausanias and afterwards: plan. 3. Petersen curtly demolishes the whole of Dörpfeld's argument. 4. Wolters on two funeral stelæ, found near Larissa and now in the museum there. 5. Milchhöfer on minor antiquities and inscriptions in Attica, excluding Athens: to be continued. 6. Winter on an archaic funeral stele with reliefs, found at Lamptre in Attica and now in Athens: plate. 7. Reisch on a marble relief of Heracles and the lion, also from Lamptre; and a terra-cotta relief with the same subject, from the Acropolis: plate. 8. Stschoukareff on a very fragmentary legal inscription on the Acropolis.—C. T.

Römische Mittheilungen. 1887: part 2. Rome.

1. De Rossi and Helbig on the life and work of Wilhelm Henzen. 2. Tommasi-Crudeli on malaria in ancient and modern Rome; suggesting that various deaths commonly attributed to poisoning were really caused by malaria. 3. Studniczka on an archaic bronze statue of a boy, probably a victor in the games, in the Palazzo Sciarra-Colonna; mentioned by Winckelmann and others, but never before published: three plates. 4. Mau on the excavation of a large house in the eighth region at Pompei, already partly excavated in 1769: plan. 5. Lignana doubts the authenticity of the inscription on a fibula from Praeneste discussed by Dümmler in the last part.—C. T.

Revue Archéologique. May—June, 1887. Paris.

1. M. Heuzey on the Persian robe termed *καυδάκης*, illustrated by a Chaldean statue, a Babylonian statuette, a piece of Egyptian textile fabric, all in the Louvre, and other objects: two plates. 2. M. Mowat on Oscan inscriptions combined with types of coins; showing that the reliefs on the terra-cotta stele with an Oscan inscription, found near Capua and now in the British Museum, represent an As and a Quincussis of about 275 B.C.: plate. 3. M. Deloche

on signet rings of the Merovingian period : continued. 4. Dr. Néroutsos-Bey on Greek inscriptions from Alexandria : continued. 5. M. Guillemaud on Gaulish inscriptions : continued—the inscription of Novara. 6. Discovery of Gallo-Roman pottery at Mantoche by M. Viroit. 7. M. Leval publishes a Byzantine inscription at Constantinople.—C. T.

Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique. May—November, 1887. Athens and Paris.

1. MM. Cousin and Deschamps publish inscriptions fixing the site of Oys in Caria. 2. M. Duchesne on the epitaph of Macedonios, bishop of Apollonias in Lydia in 366 A.D., lately found there by M. Fontrier. 3. M. Paris publishes inscriptions from the temple of Athene Cranaia at Elatea, seven of which relate to the indemnity paid by Phocis to Delphi after the Sacred War. 4. M. Clerc publishes inscriptions from the valley of the Mæander. 5. M. Holleaux publishes two archaic bronze statuettes found by him within the temple of Apollo Ptoos, one representing an 'Apollo' and the other a warrior : two plates. There is a third plate of three archaic bronze lions, but no corresponding text. 6. M. Foucart publishes an inscription from Halos in Phthiotis recording enfranchisements of slaves during two years, and thereby determines the calendar in use there. 7. MM. Deschamps and Cousin publish seven inscriptions from the temple of Zeus Panamaros near Stratoniceia in Caria, recording the services rendered by members of one family in the age of the Antonines. 8. MM. Radet and Lechat on the sites of Ægæ, Attaleia and Sandarna.—C. T.

Gazette Archéologique. 1887. Nos. 3, 4.

1. Henzey on certain engraved seals and cylinders principally from Aidin, which he localises to a school of art in Asia Minor. 3. Odobesco on a silver dish and a stone sarcophagus both with subjects in relief, found in Roumania : two plates. 4. Reinach on a bust of an athlete in the Louvre, formerly in the Villa Borghese, and which he compares to the athletic statues of Pythagoras of Rhegium : plate. 5. Reinach publishes a head of black granite in the Constantinople Museum, which is possibly a portrait-head in the guise of Bacchus Ammon : plate. 6. Collignon notes the fragments of an archaic marble male figure recently acquired by the Louvre : plate.—C. S.

The same. 1887. Nos. 5, 6.

2. Pottier : a series of most important vases, hitherto unedited, of the Musée de Ravestein at Brussels : two plates. 4. Bapst : discovery of tombs at Siverskaia in the Caucasus, with objects dating from about 100 B.C. : plate : (to be continued). 4. Mowat : bronze statuette (a portrait) from Bayonne, in the Musée St. Germain : plate. 5. Reinach on the apotheosis of Homer : the so-called figure of Melpomene is more probably Mnemosyne ; the muse descending the mountain, not Thalia, but Kalliope : plate. 7. Danicourt : an intaglio representing a Gaulish portrait head.

C. S.

Ἐφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογική. 1887. Part 1. Athens.

1. Philios : an honorary decree (fifty-three lines) from Eleusis. 2. Staes : decree of Megarians (ninety-six lines) as to land in dispute between Korinth and Epidaurus. 3. Palaiologos Georgiou : three inscriptions from the Akropolis of Athens. 4. Staes : an archaic statuette of Athena recently found near the Enecheion, consisting of two vertical sections in thin strips of sphurelaton which has been gilt : plate. 5. Sophokles : an archaic torso and part of a horseman, in marble, from Athens : two plates. 6. The same : the archaic bronze portrait-head recently found on the Akropolis : plate. 7. Stschoukareff : decree from Akropolis honouring Kanephoris, with an Archon's

name hitherto unknown. 8. Koumanoudes : an inscribed marble disk from the Olympieion at Athens : and a decree from Thisbè recording the erection of a statue of Caracalla there. 9. The same : three unpublished dikast tickets.—C. S.

Bullettino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale di Roma. 1887. Rome.

Part 5. (i.) *Compte Rendu* of discoveries in Rome : specially notable are—an inscription recording that in the last century of the Republic the magistri and flamines restored one of the sacella compitalia on the Oppian hill—and a *farissa* found on the Esquiline : a deposit of exvotos in terra-cotta representing all parts of the human body, and probably dedicated to a healing deity. Gatti's conjecture that this deity was Minerva Medica is strengthened by the discovery of a terra-cotta head of Minerva, and a votive dedication to her, published by Visconti in (ii.) : plate. He also describes a marble statue probably of the same deity, which has long lain unnoticed in a convent garden hard by. The same writer notes the discovery of a mosaic near Rome representing Pluto in the act of seizing Proserpine. Part 6. (i.) *Compte Rendu* continued : chiefly Roman inscriptions. (ii.) Visconti continues description of Esquiline find ; terra-cotta statuettes of Greek style : assigns date broadly from last century of Republic to end of first century A.D. : double plate. Near the Porta Portese has been found a Græco-Roman marble basin, carved with a combat of Lapiths and Centaurs : and some late marble heads, including one of the Knidian Venus ; near the piazza Cenci, part of a large marble relief representing a sacrificial scene ; and a fragment with the figure of Psyche : and near the Porta S. Lorenzo a fine marble sarcophagus with the vengeance of Medea, resembling the one in the Mantua Museum. Part 7 (i.) Gatti : front of a marble sarcophagus found near porta Maggiore, with relief of betrayal of Judas, about fourth century A.D. (ii.) Borsari : a slab of marble with rare treatment of a subject from the myth of Pentheus and the Maenads : plate. (iii.) *Compte Rendu* continued : *inter alia*, a marble base with metrical Greek inscription dedicating a statuette of Herakles : an account of the tombs found by Sir S. Lumley in the Vigna Jacobini.—C. S.

Bullettino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale di Roma. 1887. Rome.

PART 8. (I.) Visconti describes the find last month at the Via del Colosseo of two large fragments of a marble frieze 1·5 metre high, which must have represented a large Gigantomachia. The one fragment, 1·24 metre long, includes an Artemis (like the Versailles type, but *winged*), a draped female in a pensive attitude, (Gaia?), and part of a male figure, armed with a hammer : this attribute, and a pair of pincers at his feet mark him as Hephaistos. The other fragment, 1·24 metre long, is more damaged : on it are part of a female (Hera?, as in the Pergamene frieze) hurling a spear or torch in violent movement, and another (whose face is the only one preserved) rushing with a torch resting against her arm, win on her forehead, and winged endromides, apparently an Erinyes. The style appears to be that of the best Græco-Roman period, probably of Augustan age. Visconti suggests that the frieze may have formed part of the Templum Telluris dedicated originally A. U. C. 484, and probably rebuilt by Augustus : plate in phototype. (II.) Gatti, *compte rendu* : among sculptures, part of a sarcophagus, with a Genius leaning on a reversed torch ; and a small military trophy of dresses and arms with an elephant's head in the middle, and over all a lionskin on which a nude

figure is seated. Notes by late Prof. Henzen on certain inscriptions from the Via Saluria referring to the functionaries of the 'Factio Prasina' of the Circus. Near Frascati a tomb has been found with a skeleton having around the neck a circlet of bronze inscribed thus: 'Tene me et reboea me Aproniano Palatino ad Mappa (m) Aurea (m) in Abentino quia fugi.' It had evidently belonged to a slave who had escaped and been recaptured. De Rossi compares it with a bulla found in 1884, which bore this inscription: 'Fugitibus so revoea me in Abentino in domu Potiti ne ad Decianas.'—C. S.

Journal of Hellenic Studies. 1887. Vol. VIII. No. 1.

1. A. S. Murray: the Capua rhyton (in the British Museum) in form of sphinx: the subject painted above the sphinx is not 'Triton, Nikè, and other figures,' but Kekrops and Nikè, with Erichthonios, Pandrosos and another of the Kekropidae: two plates. 2. Imhoof-Blumer and P. Gardner complete their numismatic commentary on Pausanias: five plates. 3. Paton: excavations in Caria: woodcuts. 4. E. L. Hicks: study on history of Iasos. 5. E. Gardner: two Naukratite vases: plate. 6. Leaf discusses the trial scene in *Iliad* xviii., arguing that it gives a form of procedure 'the oldest in chronology, though not in evolution' known to us. 7. Ridgeway: the Homeric talent, its origin, value, and affinities. 8. E. Gardner: recently discovered archaic sculptures. 10. The same: a late elegiac Greek inscription of sixteen lines, epitaph of a lady Areskousa: from Boiai in Lakonia. 11. A. H. Smith: notes on a tour in Asia Minor: with map. 12. Note by J. E. Harrison giving from Prof. Milani the provenance of two vases published *ante* vol. vii. pl. lxx. p. 198, fig. 2.

Excavations in Greece 1886-7. Sculpture and Epigraphy 1886-7. *Reviews*: 'Naukratis, the third memoir of the Egypt Exploration Fund'; Reinach's 'Conseils aux Voyageurs arch. en Grèce'; Furtwängler's vase catalogue of Berlin. The second editions of Klein's 'Meistersignaturen' and 'Euphronios'; Winter's 'Jüngerer attischen Vasen'; Morgenthau's 'Zusammenhang der Bilder auf Gr. Vasen'; Schneider's 'Troische Sagenkreis'; Vogel's 'Scenen Euripideischer Tragödien in Gr. Vasengemälden'; Meisterhans' 'Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften'; Collitz' 'Sammlung der Gr. Dialekt-Inschriften'; Loewy, 'Insehr. Gr. Bildhauer'; Reinach's 'Traité d'Épigr. grecque'; Latyshev's 'Inscriptiones Tyrae, Olbiae, Chers. Taur., &c.'; Busolt's 'Gr. Gesch.' vol. i.; Duncker's 'History of Greece', vols. i. ii.; Holm's 'Gr. Gesch.' vol. i.; Head's 'Historia Numorum'; Beloch's 'Bevölkerung der Gr.-röm. Welt.'

There is some talk of bringing out this journal in a new dress after this year, the plates and text being combined in one cover, of imperial 8vo., about the dimensions *e.g.* of the *Atti dei Lincei*. An index will also be issued to the first eight volumes.—C. S.

Journal of the British and American Archaeological Society of Rome. Vol. I. 3. Rome 1887.

1. Sir J. Lumley: Inaugural address. 2. Nichols: remarks on the Regia. 3. Miles: Gavinana in Tuscany. 4. Searle: the site of the villa of Catullus at Tivoli. 5. Pullan: recent archaeological discoveries in Rome.—C. S.

The Numismatic Chronicle. 1887. Parts I and II. vol vii. third series.) 1. Rev. W. Greenwell. 'The Electrum Coinage of Cyzicus.' A monograph of 125 pages, giving a full list of the coins with discussions on the types, &c. It is accompanied by six autotype plates of the principal specimens. 2. J. N. Svoronos 'The inscription ΤΙΣΤΡΟΙ on Coins of Gortyna.' The writer discusses the views of Von Sallet and Wroth as to the meaning of this inscription. He thinks that it may be a synonym for 'Gortynians,' thus indicating the issuers of the coin.

Annuaire de la Société française de Numismatique. March-April. 1887. W. Froehner.—Obituary notice of Baron Lucien de Hirsch, the well-known collector of Greek coins (died 6 April, 1887).—A. de Belfort. —'Trouvaille de Reims.' On a hoard of 753 Roman silver coins recently discovered in, or near, Reims. The earliest piece is of Vespasian (or Titus?); the latest, of Alexander Severus (A.D. 79—A.D. 227).—List of prices realised at the Ponton d'Amécourt sale of Roman gold coins in April, 1887.

Annuaire de la Société française de Numismatique. May-June. 1887. E. Revillout. 'Second Letter to M. Lenormant on Egyptian Coins.' 'On the rate of Interest'.—A. Oreschnikow. 'A Coin with the monogram BAM.' (BAMI.) According to the writer, struck by Mithradates Eupator at Pergamon—E. Demole. 'The history of an inedited Aureus of the Emperor Quintillus.' Now in the possession of the Baron Viry-Cohendier. Reverse type = 'fides militum'.—A. de Belfort. 'An inedited Aureus of the Emperor Postumus.' Reverse type = 'aequitas'.—Notices of recent sales.—Finds of Coins.

Revue Numismatique. 3rd. series, vol. v. Deuxième trimestre. 1887. Baron L. de Hirsch, 'Orontobates or Rhoontopates.' On coins of Orontobates the Carian Satrap. The correct reading is shown to be 'Rhoontopates,' or, possibly, 'Orhoontopates,' and not 'Othontopates'.—T. Reinach. 'Mithradates Eupator and his father.' On the tetradrachms bearing the name of Mithradates Philopator Philadelphus (Euergetes,) the father of Mithradates the great (Eupator.)—E. Babelon. 'Marcus Annus Afrinus, Governor of Galatia.' On coins &c. of Leonium and Pessinus with his name.—Obituary notice of Baron L. de Hirsch.—Review of Head's *Historia Numorum*.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Journal of Philology. Emendationes Propertianae. By A. E. Housman—Miscellanea Critica. By A. Palmer.—Life and Poems of Juvenal. By H. Nettleship.—Notes in Latin Lexicography. By H. Nettleship.—The Title of the second book of Nonius. By H. Nettleship.—On the fragments of the Latin Hexameter Poem contained in the Herculanean Papyri. By R. Ellis.—Kin and Custom. By F. B. Jevons.—Pausan. viii 16 § 5. By John E. B. Mayor.—Seneca Ep. 19 § 3. By John E. B. Mayor.—Ovid, *Met.* iv

139—141. By John E. B. Mayor.—A lost Edition of Sophocles' *Philoctetes*. By John Masson.—Lucretiana. By J. P. Postgate.—The Pugio Fidei. By S. M. Schiller-Szinessy.—A Roman MS. of the Culex. By Robinson Ellis.—Aristarchos' Reading and Interpretation of *Iliad*, v 358—9. By W. Leaf.—Servius on *Aeneid*, ix 289. By H. Nettleship.

Hermathena, no. xiii. Dublin. Notes on Tyrrell's Correspondence of Cicero vol. ii (Robinson Ellis);

a paper on the origin of the Greek Interjections (T. Maguire), [in the reference to *King Lear* Kent is written by mistake for Gloster]; Translation as a Fine Art (R. Y. Tyrrell) with illustrations from Jebb and Verrall; Miscellanea (T. Maguire) contains *Choeph.* 526—549, 691, 2, *Agam.* 612, Herodotus on the vote of the Spartan kings, Catull. lxxvi 21, 2, Claud. in *Ruf.* i 65, 6, *Nupt. Hon.* 106—8, Lucan ii 21—8, vi 471, 2, Tac. *Hist.* i 25, *Aen.* iv 436 vii 116—120, 580—600, ix 138—140 (we prefer the usual rendering: how does Dr. M. explain *non?*) x 185—193, 96—8, xi 266—8, xii 52, 3, *Phaedo* 101 D. *Oed. R.* 27; Verrall's *Septem* (J. J. Beare); Paronomasia in Pindar (J. B. Bury); Roman Account books (L. C. Purser); *Sept c Theb.* (A. W. Verrall) in reference to criticisms by J. J. Beare and R. Y. Tyrrell; Miscellanea critica (A. Palmer) contains Aesch. *Pers.* 164, *Eum.* 272, Eur. *Hec.* 302, 441, 510, 775, 974, 1209, 1271, 1286, 1421, 1505, 1590, 1597, *II. F.* 257, 936, 1351, *Cycl.* 95, 343, *El.* 687, *Andr.* 346, 746, 962, 990, 1065, *Ranuc* 19, 269, 465, 1298, *Plaut.* *Pers.* 94, 358, 651, *Rud.* 298, 315, 383, 556, 1368, *Stich.* 538, 549, 669, *Truc.* 746, 989, Cic. *Eam.* iii i, 1, Hor. *Sat.* i. 2, 25, *Juv.* viii. 237; Greek Geometry from Thales to Euclid no. 7 (G. J. Allmann.)

Transactions of the American Philological Association. vol. xvii. Boston, 1887. The articles bearing on Classical philology are: Phonetic Law (a criticism of the neo-grammarians doctrine) by F. B. Tarbell; Notes on Homeric Zoology (a criticism of Buchholz) by Julius Sachs; Sources of Seneca *De Beneficiis* by H. N. Fowler; the Dative Case in Sophocles by B. W. Wells. The Appendix contains abstracts of papers read before the Association at their meeting in July 1886.

Athenaeum: 25 June; a letter from Mr. Bent on Discoveries in Thasos, a second appears in the 23 July number. 23 July; reviews of Casagrandi's *Storia e Archeologia Romana* (L. Calpurnius Piso, the Abdication of Diocletian, Tacitus &c.). 30 July; notice of Loofs' *Leontius von Byzanz*: Notes from Crete by J. Hirst. 13 August; review of *Antike Denkmäler* herausg. v. K. Deutschen Archäologischen Institut.

Academy: 25 June; a letter from J. O. Westwood on the Cod. Amiatinus. 2 July; notices of classical books (Adam's *Plato's Apology*, Holden's *Cyropaedia*, Seecks die Quellen der Odyssee, &c.). 9 July, a letter from G. Hirschfeld on the Inscriptions from Naukratis: the correspondence is continued by him and by E. A. Gardner. W. M. Flinders Petrie and A. H. Sayce in the Nos. for 16 July, 6 August, 20 August, 27 August. 16 July; an obituary of A. F. Pott. 13 August; letter on a Roman (?) pavement (with inscription) recently found in London by W. Thompson Watkin (a further letter by J. Hoskyns-Abraham on 3 September). 3 September; a letter on a Roman Inscription found at Chester by W. T. Watkin. 10 September; notice of H. Nettleship's Passages for translation into Latin Prose.

Blätter f. d. Bayer. Gymnasialschulwesen xxiii Heft 4. L. Dittmeyer, The spuriousness of Aristot. h. an. bk ix (part 3, conclusion).—Reviews (1) of H. Nohl, Cic. oratt. sel. pt. III (Leipzig, Freytag, 1886), by C. Hammer; (2) of Verg. *Aen.* vii—xii. With Germ. notes by Th. Ladewig. 8th ed. by C. Schafer (Berlin, Weidmann, 1886) and (3) of Verg. *Aen.* schol. in usum ed. W. Klouček (Leipzig) Freytag, Schenkl's texts), both by Hans Kern; (4) of H. v. Arnim's *Eurip. Med.* with Germ. notes.

2nd ed. (Berlin, Weidmann, 1886; a reconstruction of Schöne's ed.), by H. Stadtmüller.

Heft 5 and 6. Joh. Proschberger, Studies in Horace I (c. II 12).—C. Meiser, a contribution to the solution of the Katharsis question (the Aristotelian *κάθαρσις τῶν παθημάτων*).—Jos. Sarreiter, Regulations for teaching in Austrian gymnasia I. 'Latin and Greek.' Reviews (1) of the Caesar lexicons of Meusel and Menge—Preuss, by G. Landgraf; (2) of Cic. de or., with Germ. notes by K. W. Piderit. 6th ed. by O. Harnecker. Bk. 1 (Leipzig, Teubner, 1886) by Ed. Stroebel, who complains that Wilkins's ed. has been neglected; (3) and (4) of Em. Reichenhart 'Der Infinitiv bei Lucretius' (acta semin. Erlang. iv 457—526, 1886; compared with Krause 'de Vergilii usurpatione inf. Halle 1878,' Joh. Schmidt 'de usu inf. ap. Lucanum, Valerium, Silium. Halle 1881,' J. Senger über den Inf. bei Catull, Tibull, Propert. Speier 1886.' Progr.), and L. Schwabe's Catullus (Berl. Weidmann, 1886) by F. Schaeffer, who is surprised that in 110 7 Schwabe has not accepted Munro's simple emendation 'est furis'; (5) of 'Carlo Tanzi. Studio sulla chronologia dei libri variorum di Cassiodorio Senatore. Trieste. 1886.' pp. 36a; (6) of Hom. Od. ed. P. Cauer. 2 vols. (Leipzig, Freytag, 1886—7 Schenkl's texts), by M. Seibel; (7) of Soph. O. T. with Germ. notes by J. Holub, Paderborn, Schöningh) by Weeklein (worthless); (8) of Aristot. met. recogn. W. Christ (Lips. biblioth. Teubner) by Ch. Wirth; (9) of 'Flavii Josephi opera edidit et apparatu critico instruxit Benedictus Niese. II (ant. vi—x). Berol. Weidmann 1885.' 4to. pp. 392, by Joh. Muhl (Niese, known by his Homeric researches, was won to the study of oriental Hellenism by the late Alf. v. Gutschmid), (10) of 'B. Gerathewohl, Die Reiter und die Rittercenturien zur Zeit der röm. Republik (München, Ackermann, 1886) by M. Rottmann; (11) of Kiepert 'Atlas der alten Welt. 19 Aufl.' New bearb. v. Carl Wolf. Weimar. 1884' by G. Briedermann. Bavarian Programmes (of Gymnasia and Latin schools) of the school-year 1884—5, reviewed by Renn: (1) Ph. Weber, die Absichtssätze bei Aristoteles (Speier); (2) Fr. Krebs, zur Rektion der Kasus in der späteren historischen Gräcität (Regensburg); (3) Frid. Altinger, de rhetoricis in orationes Thucydideas scholiis (München); (4) Max Miller, Oppian's d. J. Gedicht v. d. Jagd. 1 Buch metrisch übers. u. mit. erklär. Bemerkungen versehen (Amberg.); (5) H. W. Reich, die Beweisführung des Aeschines in seiner Rede gegen Ktesiphon. II Hälfte (Nürnberg); (6) Joh. Muhl, Plutarchische Studien (Augsburg); (7) Andr. Neumeyer, Aratus von Sikyon. I (Neustadt a. d. H.); (8) Ludw. Büchner, die Besiedlung der Küsten des Pontos Euxinos durch die Milesier. I (Kempten); (9) J. M. Miller, die Beleuchtung im Altertum. I D.B. bei den Griechen (Aschaffenburg. To be followed next year by 'Lighting among the Romans').

Heft 7. Rem. Stölzle, 'Italian Gymnasia and Lycea' (the classical teaching unsatisfactory, completed in Heft 8) —Joh. Gerstenecker 'on the meaning of *si quis, si qui*' (criticising Wölfflin in Sitzungsber. d. Akad. zu München 1886 p. 268). Favorable reviews (1) of J. H. Schmalz, Sall. Jug. with German notes by Albr. Köhler; (2) of O. Brosin, Verg. *Aen.* iv—vi (Gotha, Perthes, 1886) with German notes (ibid.) by Ed. Gross; (3) of Kiessling, Hor. od. epod. with German notes (Berlin, Weidmann) by Joh. Proschberger; (4) of Schepps, Priscillian, ein neu aufgefunden lat. Schriftsteller des 4. Jahrh. (Würzburg, Stuber. 1886) by B. Sepp, who mentions, after Prof. Guerrino Amelli, of the Ambrosian library, a 10th century MS. of the chapter library at Novara, containing valuable documents relating to Monophysitism, to the councils of Constantinople (448),

Ephesus (449), Chalcedon (451). The collection was made by Dionysius Exiguus between 530 and 535; (5) of Frid. Schubert, *Soph. Trach.* (Schenkl's texts, Leipzig, Freytag, 1886), and (6) of N. Weeklein, *Soph. O. T.* with German notes (München, Lindauer, 1886). Both reviewed by K. Metzger; (7) of Guil. Studemund, *Anecdota varia Graeca musica metrica* (Berlin, Weidmann, 1886. pp. 313. 10 M.) by H. Stradtmüller, with many conjectures; (8) of Gustav Gilbert, *Handbuch d. griech. Staatsalterthümer*. II (Leipzig, Teubner, 1885, pp. viii 426) by J. Melber, who adds to both volumes inscriptions and monographs which had escaped Gilbert, or which have appeared since his work. Melber protests against the harsh censure of Wilamowitz—Möllerndorff (in *Hermes*).

Heft 8. Ed. Kurtz, on the Philogelos of Hierokles (ed. Eberhard, 1869).—Reviews by C. W. (1) of Bachrens, 'fragmenta poetarum Romanorum' (Teubner). The verses 'de cereo' (Aug. c. D. xv 22, cf. A. Rösler, Prudentius. Freib. i. B. 1886. p. 71 n. 2) have escaped the editor; (2) of Buecheler's ed. of Jahn's Persius, Juvenalis, Sulpicia.—Reviews by M. Seibel (1) Hom. II. with German notes by Ameis. I 3 (bk. vii-ix). Edited by Hentze. 3rd ed. and 'Anhang zu Hom. II. III Heft. Erläuterungen zu vii-ix' by Hentze. 2nd ed. remodelled (Leipzig, Teubner, 1886-7); (2) H. Guhrner, *Musikgeschichtliches aus Homer*. I (Lauban Gymnasium 1886).—Review by W. Zipperer of Karl Krumbacher, *Griechische Reise*. Berlin, Hettler. pp. xli, 390. 7 M.—Bavarian Programmes (1884-5) reviewed by Renn. (1) Alois Patin, *Heraklits Einheitslehre die Grundlage seines Systems und der Anfang seines Buchs* (München); (2) L. Leipert, *Beiträge zu Horaz* (Straubing); (3) Jos. Fürtner, *Textkritische Bemerkungen zu Sulpicius Severus* (Landshut); (4) Joh. Praun, *Bemerkungen zur Syntax des Vitruv mit eingehender Darstellung der Substantivsätze* (Bamberg); (5) H. Ulrich, *Vitruvii copia verborum part. II* (Schwabach); (6) Gust Landgraf, *die Vita Alexandri des Archipresbyters Leo*. I Theil die Nektaneubussage I 1-14 (first published from mss. at Bamberg and München, with an essay on the romance of Pseudo-Callisthenes); (7) *Incerti auctoris liber de origine gentis Romanae* (fragm.): ad fidem cod. Brux. qui exstat unicus denuo recensuit Bernh. Sepp. (The ms. was rediscovered by Mommsen; it is important for new readings in Cicero, Sallust, Livy, and has 'Ciceronian synonyma' not printed in Orelli; (8) Sex. Propertii *elegiarum librum primum commentariis grammaticis instruxit F. J. Hildenbrand* (Frankenthal); (9) Jos. Wismeyer, *die durch Scholien nicht erklärten kritischen Zeichen der Iliashandschrift Venetus A*.

Mnemosyne. Nova series. xv (1887), pt. 3. Lugd. Bat. Brill. *Minutiae epigraphicae*. Ser. H. J. Polak. Greek inscriptions I. from Kertsch (Rhein. Mus. xli Heft 3). II. The Brough inscription, now in the Fitzwilliam Museum, which Polak reads thus:

ἐκδεκτέη τις ἰδὼν τύμβω σκηφθέντ' ὑπὸ μούρης
'Ερμῇ Κομμαγεννὸν ἔπος φρασάτω τόδ' ὀδέϊτης.
„Χαῖρε σὺ, παῖ, παρ' ἐμοῦ, κέλπερ θνητὸν βίον ἔρπες
ὠκύτατ'—ἔπτης γάρ—μερόπων ἐπὶ Κιμμερίων γῆς,
οὐ φθίσει· ἐβίως γάρ, ὁ παῖς Ἑρμῆς, ἂν (ὕβρις) ἴ.”

III. Epitaph of Amorgos (Rhein. Mus. xxxix Heft 4). iv. Inscriptions presented to the Leyden Museum by R. J. Lennep, Dutch consul at Smyrna, and lately discussed by the septuagenarian C. Leemans. The biblical names *Τρόφιμος*, *Ἀφφία*: the Platonic *περίπτωμα*, and curses directed against the violation

of tombs, are of special interest. V. Two inscriptions from the *Philologische Wochenschrift*, no. 33, 1886; the first had already been published in 1885. VI. Lead tablets from Dodona (*Neue Jahrb.*, 1883, 305-360. VII. Two inscriptions in Dittenberger's *Sylloge*, the former (no. 349) founding at Teos a school for boys and girls (this is compared with Plin. ep. iv. 13, and with the famous essay of Musonius. Stob. ecl., ed. Wachsmuth, II 235-9, in which several corrections are suggested).—Frontin, aq. 128 (J. v. d. Vliet reads *ad <com> modum* and *<tum> quam privata*).—Ad. A. Gellii *Noctes Atticae* ser. I. C. G. Boot. The Franeker MS., used by Io. Tornaesius for his ed. 1592, has been examined throughout. In xvii 2 16 Hertz has neglected the certain conjecture of J. Fr. Gronov *versatur* for *versatur*. E. H. Eldikii *epistola critica* (obs. iii 4) de *Anthologia Latina*. Twenty years ago Boot read a notice of Erik Huibert van Eldik to the royal academy and printed some of his notes on Martial. The present letter was addressed to the younger P. Burman in 1773.—Οὐδός, ὁρσοθύρη, ῥῶγες, ser. A. E. J. Holwerda (illustrates Homer from Schliemann's discoveries at Tiryns).—De Tibulli *elegiarum structura*, ser. H. T. Karsten. *Pars altera*.—Hor. epod. 2 37 (P. J. Scriverius reads *Roma quas* for *quas amor*).—Euripidea, ser. H. Kuisser. Med. 109, read *δυσκαταπαύστοις*. 128 οὐδὲν βέβαιον (an anapaest). 345 εἰκὸς δέ σφιν. Other conjectures in Andr. 347. Alc. 330. Hee. 620, 854, 1187. Hel. 923.—Epigraphica, ser. H. v. Herwerden (in *Bullet. de Corresp. Hell.*, 1886, p. 112 ver. 12 read *πειρήζοντες*; *ibid* p. 179 for *ΑΡΙΔΕ* read *ἀνδρὶ δέ*.—Liviana, ser. J. v. d. Vliet.—Aristoph. eq. 895. L. v. Leeuwen reads *τότ' ἄξιον* for *τὸν ἄξιον*.—Quaestiones Graecae, ser. I. M. J. Valetan. II. De ostracismo.—Thuc. iv 63 2 for *ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄγαν*. L. v. Leeuwen reads *<ἔσται> ἄγαν, ἀλλὰ καί*.

Zeitschrift für oesterr. Gymnasien, xxxviii (1887) Heft 3. Homerisches, Von J. La Roche.—Review by H. Schenkl of 'Die Sprichwörtersammlung des Maximus Planude, erläutert von E. Kurtz, Leipz., 1886.' R. Rappold's review of Ov. met. with German notes by H. Magnus. II, III (bks. vi-xv).—Reviews by J. Golling (1) of Nepos. Ed. G. Genios. Paderborn and Münster. 1885; (2) of M. Heynacher 'Was ergibt sich aus dem Sprachgebrauche Cäsars im b. G. für die Behandlung der lat. Syntax in der Schule. 2 verm. Aufl. Berlin, Weidmann. 1886.'—Aug. Scheindler's severe review of Ignaz Prammer *Sall. Catil. lug.* Wien, Holder, 1886.—A. Goldbacher's review of Knoell's *Eugippius*. Vienna, Gerold. 1885-6. (The life of S. Severin appears in a greatly improved text).—Review of Baumeister's *Denkmäler* (Art. *Kadmos* to *Peiraicus*).—K. Schenkl, *The Gymnasia of Servia* (27 subjects, chiefly natural science, no Greek, Latin 4 hours a week only in the highest three classes). They correspond to the German *Realschulen*.—Review by Fr. Stolz, of 'A. Vaníček. Biographische Skizze von Dr. Glaser, Wien. Karl Cönen. 1885. pp. iv 66.' V. was professor of Comparative Philology at Prag. At the end of the book are reprinted 'Recollections of Dr. August Schleicher' from his pen.

Heft 4. Perikles and Thukydides, by J. v. Pflugk-Hartung.—J. Zahlteisch on Aristot. 1135 b 3-8. 1033 b 21 sqq.—1040 14-32.—Review by H. Schenkl of 'Anecdota varia Graeca et Latina. Ediderunt Rud. Schoell et Guil. Studemund. Vol. I. Anecdota varia Graeca, musica metrica grammatica, ed. Guil. Studemund. Berlin, Weidmann. 1886.' 8vo. pp. VI 313. 10 M.—Review by F. Hanna of Hor. sat. with German notes by Adolf Kiessling. Berlin,

Weidmann. 1886. pp. xxiv 240.—Review by E. Reisch of 'Albert Müller, Lehrbuch der griechischen Bühnenalterthümer. Freiburg i. B. 1866. Mohr' (Hermann's Lehrbuch III 2).—Reviews by A. Bauer (1) of 'G. Egelhaaf: Analekten zur Geschichte. Stuttgart, Kohlhammer. 1866' pp. 284. M. 5.40 (on the military services of Perikles, the battle of Chaironeia, Capua's defection to Hannibal, Hannibal's letter to the Rhodians); (2) of 'A. Fokke. Rettungen des Alkibiades II. Emden, Haynel. 1886.' pp. viii, 112; (3) of 'F. F. Schulz: Quibus ex fontibus fluxerunt Agidis, Cleomenis, Arati vitae Plutarchae. Berol. Hadrk. 1886. pp. VIII, 57; (4) of 'C. Peter: Zeittafeln der griechischen Geschichte. 6 verb. Aufl. Halle, Waisenhaus. 1886.' pp. IV, 166.—K. Schenkl, The Gymnasia of Serbia. A commission has issued two reports, three members recommending the separation of the Gymnasium from the Realschule, two retaining the single Gymnasium; both admit Greek and allow more time for Latin.—Review by H. S. Sedlmayer of Margoliouth, Aesch. Agam.—Review by J. Golling of 'Emendationen zu Verg. Aen. I. IV. Von Dr. G. Heidtmann. Coblenz, N. Groos. 1885.' pp. viii, 10.

Heft 5. Explanation of Plat. soph. 253^{de} by Dr. F. Lukas.—Review by A. Kornitzer of 'Demosth. ex rec. G. Dindorfii vol. I ed. iv correctior curante F. Blass. Leipzig, Teubner. 1885.'—Review by A. Zingerle of Bachrens, 'Fragmenta poetarum Latinorum. Lips. Teubner. 1886.'—Review by E. Reisch of 'Frédéric Plessis, études critiques sur Propertius et ses élégies. Paris, Hachette. 1884.'—Review by R. Bischofsky of Schmidt's abridged text of Q. Curtius (Schenkl's texts).—Review by T. Wildauer of 'Die Psychologie der Stoa von Dr. Ludwig Stein. I. Metaphysisch anthropologischer Theil. Berlin, Calvary. 1886.' pp. 216.—[Qualifications for the office of teacher in the Prussian higher schools (regulation of 5 Febr. 1887). Notice of 'The Classical Review. No. I.'

Zeitschr. f. oesterr. Gymn. xxxviii (1887). Heft 6.

M. Iskrzycki, 'scholia to the Odyssey' (additions and various readings from the Cracow ms. J of the Od., compared with Dindorf's edition).—J. Mähly, 'Vergilian doubts.'—Ign. Prammer, 'on Tacitus' (1) *silentium uisum* in Tac. Agr. 38. h. iii 13. an. iv 50 borrowed from Liv. x 34 § 6. (2) Tac. an. i 3 (the portrait of Agrippa Postumus) *rudem sane bonorum artium et robore corporis stolidi ferocem*, nullius *tamen* flagitii compertum, borrowed from Livy's account of young Titus Manlius vii 4 § 4 nullius *probi* compertum. 5 § 2 *capit consilium rudis quidem iaque agrestis animi*. § 6 *intuere* stolidi ferocem *uiribus* suis. (3) the rule of Tacitus and Sallust (Orat. vii 10 § 1) to omit the numbers slain or taken in battles, allows of some exceptions Agr. 37. an. iv 73. xiv 37. h. ii 17.—Favorable reviews (1) by Carl Ziwsa of Platon's Symposium erkl. v. Arn. Hug. 2nd ed. Leipzig 1884. pp. lxxvii, 232. 3 M. (2) by F. Lanczizky, of Platon's Meno et Euthyphro. Incerti scriptoris Theages Erastae Hipparchus. Recensuit prolegomenis et commentariis instruxit Ad. R. Fritzsche. Lipsiae, Teubner. 1885. pp. 347 (founded on Stallbaum's ed. of 1836, but practically a new work); (3) by Franz Slameczka of Ausgew. Reden des Demosthenes erkl. v. A. Westermann. vol. ii (de cor. c. Lept.). 6th. ed. by E. Rosenburg. Berlin, Weidmann. 1885; (4) (5) and (6) by A. Kornitzer of Cic. or. sel. scholarum in usum ed. Herm. Nohl (p. R. Am. Leipzig, Freytag 1884; in Q. Caec. div., in Verr. iv, v, *ibid.* 1885); Ciceros Divin. in Q. Caecilius hrsg. v. Fr. Richter. 2ed. by A. Eberhard. Leipzig, Teubner, 1884; Ciceros Rede für Archias, hrsg. v.

Fr. Richter u. A. Eberhard. 3rd. ed. Leipzig, Teubner, 1884; (7) by M. Petschenig of M. Iuniani Iustini epitoma hist. Phil. Pompei Trogi ex rec. Fr. Ruehl. Accedunt prologi in Pompeium Trogi ab A. Gutschmid recensiti. Leipzig, Teubner (bibliotheca) pp. lxii, 315. The name of the epitomator, 'M. Iunianus Iustinus' is preserved only by C, cod. Casinensis (now Laurentianus) saec. xi, to which Ruehl, in the books for which it exists, attributes the highest authority; (8) by J. Ptasechnik of Kiepert's Atlas antiquus. 8th. ed. Berlin, Reimer. This has now an index of names, which may be had separately, Pr. 1 M, 20 Pf.

Wochenschrift für Klassische Philologie.—No. 11 (16 March): H. Jordan, *Der Tempel der Vesta* (G. Zippel), describes completely and pronounces carefully on the excavations carried on since 1874.—R. Linde, *de recensionibus Apollonii Rhodii* (Al. Rzach), unduly minimises the differences between our text and the *προέκδοσις* mentioned in the Scholia.—*Scholia Hephaestionis*, ed W. Hoerschelmann (H. Reimann), relieves Schol. B so completely from the disorder introduced by Turnebus and Gaisford that it may be called an *editio princeps*.—A. Sperling, *Apion der Grammatiker*, scientifically and with much objectivity white-washes this persecutor of the Jews.—M. Giltbauer, *Streifzüge I'* (E. Wolff) ascribes great importance to β MSS. of Caesar, exaggerates somewhat and is not always convincing.

No. 12 (23 March)—B. Lorenz, *Taube im Alterthum* (M. C. P. Schmidt): table of contents. Fr. Studniczka *Geschichte der griech. Tracht* (P. Weizsäcker) a most instructive work, with a polemic against Helbig, and deserving the attention of all archaeologists.—Fr. Cauer *Aeneassage* (E. Baehrens), industrious but unsatisfactory alike in methods and results.—Th. Oesterley *Humor b. Horaz* (G. Faltn) doomed to speedy oblivion.—J. Winkesteyn *de fontibus libri de viris illustribus* (Th. Opitz) thorough and industrious.

No. 13 (30 March)—*Inscripfen griech. Bildhauer* von Em. Loewy (P. Weizsäcker), a most important, excellent and careful work.—K. Brugmann, *Vergleichende Grammatik i.* (F. Holthausen), stimulating and illuminating; includes an introduction on the original Indo-germanic home and the pronunciation of the various alphabets, and affords fresh evidence of the connection between Latin and Celtic.—*Homer* ed. Christ (A. Rzach), is an edition full of good work, but the commentary is so condensed as to be misleading, and contains many errors.—E. Wolff *Taciti Hist.* i. ii. (J. Müller), uniform with Nipperdey's *Annals*, but more of a school-book.—F. Devantier *Lat. Relativum in der Verschränkung* (Zillgenz), a clear and exhaustive discussion of a difficult point in Latin syntax.

No. 14 (6 April)—H. Osthoff *Neueste Sprachforschung* (H. Ziemer) a complete refutation of Collitz.—C. Maurer *de aris Graecorum pluribusdeis in commune positis* (H. Gloel) important.—*Homer* ed. W. Christ (A. Rzach): a list of the errors in the commentary.—*Aristotelis de Anima* recogn. G. Biehl (Dembowski) possesses much merit.—A. Kalkmann *Pausanias* (H. Ditschke) learned and lively.

No. 15 (13 April)—Roscher, *Lexikon d. Mythologie* 9 and 10 (A. Zinzow), thorough and careful.—H. Hensel, *Auctor libelli περὶ ὕψους* (Br. Keil), a careful examination of the quotations contained in the *περὶ ὕψους*.—*Periti, Juvenalis, Sulpician Sat.* Recog. Jahn-Bücheler (A. Weidner): Bücheler has made important alterations, many happy emendations and corrections in punctuation, but of course the edition is not final.

No. 16 (20 April)—*Demosthenes' Philipp.* v. Rehdantz-Blass (W. Nitsche): Blass has made a number of improvements but the edition remains practically the same.—*Euripides' Medea*, v. H. v. Arnim (Th. Barthold): practically a new edition, so little is left of Schöne's work: in criticism Arnim is weak, otherwise fair.—H. Merguet, *Lexikon zu Caesar 3 Lfrg.* (A. Neitzert) much inferior to Meusel's lexicon.—*Ellendt's Lat. Gramm.* v. Seyffert-Fries (Zillgenz): this the thirtieth edition brings the book up to modern requirements.

No. 17 (27 April)—J. v. T. Baunaek, *Studien d. griech. u. arisch. Sprachen i.* (O. Immisch): grammatical, etymological and epigraphic studies which show much insight and astonishing labour.—H. Berger, *Erdkunde der Griechen* (J. Partsch), the most important contribution to the study of ancient geography that has been made for years. Stahl, *Quaestiones ad Thucyd. pertinent.* (S. Widmann): in effect a new book and full of proofs of the science, learning and judgment of the author.—Ihne, *Römische Geschichte* vi. (G. Falin): Ihne differs from Niebuhr's estimate of Caesar, but does not believe that empire was the plan which dominated his whole life; is less severe on Cicero than is Mommsen; this vol. no more attractive to the general public than the previous five.—*Plautus*, Ritschl recog. Goetz (Anspach); Goetz much more conservative in the text than Ritschl.—Merguet, *Lexikon zu Caesar* Lfrg. 4-6 (E. Wolff), behind the times.—G. Schepss, *Ältesten Evangelienhandschriften der Würzburger Universitätsbibliothek* (Stangl) new and good MS. material for reconstructing the Itala.

No. 18 (4 May)—F. Müller *Zu den Reden bei Thukydides* (S. Widmann) stimulating.—*Heberden Euripides Medea* (Th. Barthold) makes no claims to originality.—*Dionysii Halic. antiqu. Roman.* ex. rec. A. Kiessling et V. Pron (K. Jaedby) unsatisfactory.—*C. J. Rochel de allocutionis usu apud Thucydidem, Xenophontem al.* (Br. Keil) alike unscientific and unmethodical.—A. Gerber et A. Greef *Lexicon Taciteum VI.* (E. Wolff) an excellent contribution both to the explanation of Tacitus and to the history of Latin.

No. 19 (11 May)—*Denkmäler d. klass. Altertums* 21-33 (P. Weizsäcker), the good far outweighs the bad.—H. Hesbrecht *de sacerdotii apud Gracos emptione* (P. Stengel) a thorough piece of work.—*Euripides Medea* von S. Mehler (Th. Barthold): the review discusses many passages, but does not estimate the value of the edition.—J. Kohm *Echtheit der Tetralogien des Antiphon* (H. Lewy) cautious and generally sound.—C. Th. Michaelis *de Plutarchi codice Marciano* 386 (Br. Keil) valuable.—*Corippi quae supersunt.* rec. M. Petschenig (M. Manitius) contains many happy emendations.—H. Meyer *Schriften zur Kunst* (H. Blümner) contains little that is new to the archaeologist.

No. 20 (18 May)—W. Richter *Handel u. Verkehr der Völker des Mittelmeers* (H. Blümner) readable and sound.—*Euripides' Herakliden* von W. Bauer, 2 Aufl. von N. Wecklein (H. Gloël) an excellent school edition.—*Carmina figurata Gracca* ed. C. Haeblerlin, and M. Rannow, *Studia Theocritea* (G. Knaack) the former contains some interesting discoveries and many untenable hypotheses; the latter is a sober, solid piece of work.—A. Gereke *Chrysippea* (F. Susemihl) a good contribution towards a complete collection of the fragments of Chrysippus.—Fr. Knoke *Germanicus in Deutschland* (G. Andresen) somewhat too long and somewhat uneven, but most important.

by J. Schmidt). The author's object is to supply a systematic explanatory index to all points of Roman antiquities contained in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, with references to the actual inscriptions. The work includes names of places, but excludes those of persons, with the exception of the Emperors and their families. It would be premature to express an opinion upon the value of the work on the strength of the first fifty-four pages only.

Greek Authors.—19. Arthur Ludwig, *Aristarch's homerische textkritik nach den fragmenten des Didymos dargestellt* (L. Cohn). An instructive contribution to recent Homeric literature. 20. August Fick, *Die homerische Ilias nach ihrer entstehung betrachtet und in der ursprünglichen sprachform wiederhergestellt* (H. F. Müller). The reviewer finds no ground for believing in the existence of an Aeolian Iliad. 21. A. Brand, *über die ausdrücke der zeit bei Homer* (L. Schmidt). Mainly on ἡώς and its various epithets in Homer. 22. K. Sander, *über die zeiteintheilung in den homerischen gedichten* (L. Schmidt). On the duration of the events described in the Iliad and Odyssey. 23. R. Linde, *de diversis recensitionibus Apollonii Rhodii Argonauticon* (R. Volkmann). A somewhat diffuse but interesting dissertation. The author attacks many of Merkel's views, and finally disposes of that scholar's hypothesis of a triple recension of the Argonautica. 24. J. Pomtow, *Poetae lyrici Graeci minores* (E. von Leutsch). 25. B. L. Gildersleeve, *The Olympian and Pythian Odes, with an introductory Essay, &c.* (O. Crusius). Well suited for beginners. The editor mainly confines himself to the avowed object of recording the most important results of German research; and this he does with an enthusiasm and skill that deserve recognition. The introductory essays are clear, concise and stimulating; but too little is said on the life of Pindar and too much on the metrical schemes of J. H. H. Schmidt. The use of Greek coins for the embellishment of a popular edition of an author like Pindar merits approval; but the reproduction of the Eastern pediment of the temple of Zeus at Olympia is on far too small a scale. 26. M. Rannow, *Studia Theocritea* (C. Haeblerlin). Part i, on the date of Idylls xvi, xvii, xiv, xv. Part ii is devoted to proving that Theocritus did not imitate Callimachus. 27. S. Reiter, *De syllabarum in trisemam longitudinem productarum usu Aeschyleo et Sophocleo* (R. Hildebrandt). Cap. 1, summary of the opinions of Hermann, Apel, Boeckh, Feussner, Bellermann, Rosbach and Westphal, J. H. H. Schmidt, M. Schmidt and Christ on the instances in choral metres of a long syllable being specially lengthened so as to be metrically equivalent to three or more short syllables. Cap. 2, numerous examples from Aeschylus and Sophocles, showing that, in certain circumstances, a lengthened syllable equivalent to 'three times' —, antistrophically corresponds to —, or — — — or —. Cap. 3, on the use of a long syllable as equivalent to 'four times' especially in the ionic and dochmiac metres of Aeschylus and Sophocles. Cap. 4, on the circumstances in which the lengthened syllable equivalent to 'three times' is used by these poets. The writer shows a thorough familiarity with the theory of Greek metre and the criticism and exegesis of the tragic poets. Chap. 2 is of special importance in showing that Aeschylus and Sophocles are far less corrupt than is generally supposed, and that it is high time to restore to those authors a purer text by the removal of modern 'emendations.' The whole work is worthy of careful study by all who are interested in the criticism of the tragic poets. 28. T. Zielinski, *Die märchenkomödie in Athen* (W. Uckermann). The author regards the Birds of

The *Philologischer Anzeiger*, vol. xvii, parts 2 and 3.

18. Ettore di Ruggiero, *Dizionario epigrafico di antichità romane*, fasc. i, ii, *abacus—ab actis* (rev.

Aristophanes as the only surviving example of this kind of comedy; but finds traces of ancient folklore in other plays. Some of these fragmentary allusions may be illustrated by the folklore of modern Greece (e.g. Vesp. 794 ff. by Hahn ii 85.) 20. C. F. Müller, *Ignatii Diaconi tetrasticha iambica* 53, versus in *Adamum* 143. *De Ignatii metrica arte vita scriptis disputatio* (F. Haussen). The introduction confirms the view that Ignatius Diaconus flourished in the first half of the ninth century. It is to be regretted that the editor has not used any fresh manuscript material: and that he has not discussed the prosody of his author, with a view to showing *inter alia* whether the *Anacrononta* ascribed to him are genuine or not. 30. A. Bauer, *Thukydides und H. Müller-Strübing. Ein beiträg zur geschichte der philologischen methode*. An interesting defence of Thucydides against the attacks of Müller-Strübing, and a well-timed protest against the destructive criticism, of which it is a typical example. 31. A. Kalkmann, *Pausanias der Perieget* (K. Seeliger). An elaborate review extending over 14 pp., closing with the statement of the reviewer's opinion that, though the materials collected in Kalkmann's treatise will be gratefully used by all who are engaged in research on the subject of Pausanias, yet his views as to the sources from which Pausanias derived his information can only be regarded with grave mistrust. 32 and 33. J. Kohn, *ein beiträg zur frage über die echtheit der tetralogien des redners Antiphon*, in two parts (F. Blass). The author rightly maintains the genuineness of the speeches, though he does not pay sufficient attention to differences of style between the tetralogies and the other speeches (e.g. in the use of particles). 34. H. Buermann, *Die handschriftliche überlieferung des Isokrates*; ii, *Der Urbinus und seine verwandtschaft* (F. Blass). The first part of Buermann's treatise on the mss of Isocrates was reviewed in *Phil. Anz.* in 1885, p. 410. The present deals with the *codex Urbinus* alone, and with the textual inferences to be drawn from the corrections in that ms. The reviewer looks forward with interest to the publication of the rest of the treatise.

Latin Authors.—35. I. L. Ussing, *T. Macci Plauti comœdiæ*; vol. v, *Persa*, *Rudens*, *Stichum*, *Trinummum*, *Truculentum continens*. Ussing's edition of Plautus is now complete, with the exception of the *Cistellaria* and *Casina*. In spite of the good service done by the editor in certain passages of the text, the present volume, as a whole, is not calculated to change the unfavourable opinion which German scholars have formed respecting the parts already published. Commentaries like those of Brix on the *Miles Gloriosus* and of Lorenz on the *Pseudolus* contain more trustworthy information on the language of Plautus than is to be found in all the eighteen plays of Ussing's edition. The reviewer, who does not sign his name, illustrates his remarks by an examination of some passages of the *Persa*. 36. J. S. Speijer, *Lana Satura* (C. Haeblerlin). A pamphlet containing (1) a discussion of the meaning of *Orcus*; (2) a new explanation of Hor. Sat. i 5, 87, 'oppidulum versu quod dicere non est'; (3) emendations on Virgil, Horace, Cicero, Livy, Tacitus; (4) grammatical observations on *est* = *edit*, and on *pecunia*, *cupere alienius* and the *nominativus prædicationis*. (1) *Orcus*, according to Speijer, is always the god of the underworld, never the underworld itself; if so, in Aen. iv 242, 'animas ille evocat Orcus,' we must not only understand *ab*, but also alter *evocat* into *avocat*. The reviewer suggests that *Orcus* may here be a 'dativus ethicus': 'er ruff dem Orcus die seelen fort.' (2) The *oppidulum* is identified as *Vēnūsā*, not as *Equum Tuticum* (*Schol. ad loc.*), which does not lie on the route described, and can be got into hexameter verse (by separating its

two parts and eliding the last syllable). (3) Of the emendations, the reviewer approves Aen. iv 610, 'et Dirae ultrices fidei' (for *et Di*).

Greek History, &c.—37. Arnold Schaefer, *Demosthenes und seine Zeit*, vol. i and ii of revised ed. 1885-6 (H. Landwehr). The first vol. of this admirable work was revised by Schaefer himself, the second by one of the late Professor's pupils, M. Hoffmann, with the help of Usener and Kirchhoff. The evidence of inscriptions discovered since 1856-8 has been taken into account in the new edition, and the whole work has been very carefully revised; vol. i includes a lithograph of a bust of Dem.; vol. ii, one of the statue at Knole; to vol. iii Michaelis contributes an excursus on the extant portraits of Dem. 38. Boeckh, *Die staatshaushaltung der Athener*, ed. 3, in two vols.; with notes by M. Fränkel (H. Landwehr). A worthy edition of a great work. 39. F. B. Jevons, *History of Greek Literature from the earliest period to the death of Demosthenes* (K. Sittl). A work that shows familiarity with the most recent literature of the subject, as well as critical ability and common sense. The reviewer makes a few corrections on points of detail; and suggests that, in a future edition the introductory chapter might, with advantage, be expanded.

Roman History, &c. 40 and 41. K. W. Nitsch, *Geschichte der römischen republik; nach dessen hinterlassenen papieren und vorlesungen herausgegeben von dr. G. Thouret*. 2 vols. (M. Zoeller.) A work which, in spite of certain faults, can be thoroughly recommended to all who are engaged in the special study of Roman History. 42. E. Marks, *de alis, quales in exercitu Romano tempore liberæ reipublicæ fuerint* (A. Bauer). Shews that, down to the time of the Marsic war, the word *ala* is used of the mixed contingent of cavalry and infantry furnished by the allies of Rome (*ala sociorum*); and afterwards, of cavalry alone (*reiter-ala*). 43. M. Siebourg, *de Suleris Campestribus Fatis dissertatio epigraphica* (Joh. Schmidt). Conspectus of inscriptions referring to the *Suleriac* (p. 1-16), with two appendices on the *dea Sules* (?) of Bath and on the *Silvanae* (16-20), the *Campestres* (20-25); the *Fati*, *Fatae* (25-28). The cult of the *Suleriac* and the *Matres* (or *Matronae*) prevailed in Celtic and German districts during the first three centuries of the Roman Empire; but (as the reviewer shows) was not confined to 'homines humiliores.' Similarly in the case of the *Campestres*. On the *Fatae* the writer ought to have noticed the evidence derived from coins. 44. H. Maué, *die vereine der fabri, centurarii und dendrophori in römischen reich* (E. Herzog). A valuable pamphlet on some of the guilds of the Roman empire. 45. P. Willems, *les élections municipales à Pompéi* (E. Herzog). A model of antiquarian and epigraphic research, in the form of a popular lecture by the learned author of the 'Droit public romain,' and 'Le sénat de la république.'

Travel.—46. M. Toussaint, *Von klassischen stätten. Reiseerinnerungen und geschichtliche rückblicke*; and 47. Ed. Engel, *Griechische frühlingstage* (L. Bornemann). Toussaint's pamphlet contains an account of a visit to Rome, Naples, Paestum and Selinus, and a voyage from Messina to Athens; for many of his details, he professes to be mainly indebted to the works of Gregorovius, Dörpfeld, Michaelis and Ross. Engel's book is distinctly original. It is inspired throughout by a warm appreciation of the modern inhabitants of Greece; and in spite of certain faults of style and taste, is thoroughly interesting, especially its account of the author's tour in the Peloponnesus. He is evidently more at home in the life and language of the modern Greeks, than in matters connected with Greek Archaeology.

The number closes with bibliography (p. 203-15); items of philological news (216-22); and contents of philological periodicals (222-7).

Kuhn's Zeitschrift xxix, Nos. I. and II., pp. 1-59. —R. Lenz.—On the physiology and history of the palatals, dealing especially with the palatalisation of gutturals in the Romance languages; pp. 59-124.—F. Solmsen.—Sigma in combination with nasals and liquids in Greek—an elaborate collection of instances illustrating the laws given by Brugmann, *Gr. Gr.* § 45, 55. (i) I.-E. *s* + nasal and nasal + *s* medially between vowels in Urigriech. are assimilated to double nasal; the double nasal is kept in Lesbian and Thessalian, elsewhere simplified with lengthening of preceding vowel, e.g. I.-E. *ḡsmé-*, Lesb. *ἄμμες* Att. *ἡμεῖς*. (ii) Nasal + *σ* + consonant loses nasal, without lengthening preceding vowel—e.g. *δεσπότης* = *δεμσ-πότης* (except *n* + *s* + *i*, which becomes *νσσ* and falls under iii.) (iii) Nasal + *σ* initially and medially between vowels, if originating within the limits of Greek, in Argive, Cretan, Arcadian, and Thessalian remains unchanged; elsewhere nasal lost and preceding vowel becomes in Lesbian an *i*-diphthong, elsewhere is lengthened. Continuation promised.—Pp. 124-152—J. Wackernagel.—Miscellen (i) liquids and nasals + *σ*; in accented syllables combination remains, *mutatis mutandis* (*ῥπος* = *ῥσος*), in unaccented *σ* lost with lengthening of vowel (*οὔρα*). (ii) Attic contraction of *εFo*, *οFa*, contracted when accent comes later (*νομηνία*), uncontracted under the accent (*νέος*). *πλέον* (neut. sing.) in Aristoph—in other forms *πλεῖον*(ων). *πλεῖον* being properisponemon had main accent on *ε*; *ι* consequently dropped: but in *πλεῖονες* *ι* bore main accent. (iii) *ἐκάστος* from an earlier *ἐκάστις* (each for himself, cf. *quisque*) gen.* *ἐκάστεο ἐκάστου*, whence *ἐκάστος*. (iv) *αἶδω*—Orig. aor. *ἀ-Fe-Fδ-ον* = *ἀFeιδον* as *ἐ-Fe-Fπ-ον* = *ἐειπον* (K. Z. xxv. 306), which has passed to a pres. stem (cf. *ἀ-υδή*). Pp. 152-176—P. Kretschmer.—The Corinthian Vase Inscriptions. Pp. 176-188—F. Burg. On the relation of writing to speech. Pp. 188-192—K. Krumbacher. Supplementary to previous article (xxvii. 484) on the history of the Greek language. P. 192—Wilbrandt connects *cella* (**cērla*) with *cēra*.

Revue de Linguistique et de Philologie Comparée. Paris. 15 Janvier, 1887.—A. Hovelacque and Jean Kirste review favourably *La Linguistique Évolutionniste* of Paul Regnaud, who follows the older philologists in all save theory of *guna* or vowel-intensification. He regards *a* as the original vowel and refers all consonants save liquids and nasals to a whistling and explosive group. Primitive roots were few in number, simple in meaning. Raoul De La Grasserie continues his inquiry into the distinctions of number in the Indo-European languages. Paul Regnaud complains of L. Havet for neglecting 'linguistique' in his recent *Abrégé de Grammaire latine*, and discusses the reserve of modern philology in the matter of first principles.—15 Avril, 1887.—C. A. Pietrement begins an account of the *Patois Briard*. Paul Regnaud reviews Darmesteter's *La Vie des Mots*—doubts the plan of sketching the philosophy of language from a single speech—says that among forces which preserve language the author has forgotten the grammarians—thinks the dark ages caused decay of literary Latin, not its crystallisation—doubts author's distinction between German as rich in compounds, and Romance as rich in derivatives—

considers the work valuable in details and a contribution to the history of French, if not a contribution to the philosophy of Language.

Theologischer Literaturzeitung, herausg. von Ad. Harnack u. E. Schürer. The following articles may be noticed. 26 Mar.: Gwynn, On a Syriac MS. belonging to the collection of Archbishop Ussher (Nestle). Dr. Gwynn shows that Ussher's MS., which was supposed to contain a Syriac translation of the whole of the N. T., still exists in Trin. Coll. Dublin, but that it contains only those portions of the N. T. which are wanting in the Peshito—John viii., the four smaller Catholic Epistles, and the Apocalypse. It is important for the textual criticism of these portions. 9 April: Ueber ein in Deutschland bisher unbekannte Fälschung des Simonides (A. Harnack). Dräseke published in the *Zeitschrift für Wissensch. Theologie*, 1887, pt. 2, the conclusion of the *Shepherd* of Hermas in Greek, which has hitherto been wanting. This is taken from a collection of Greek treatises edited by Simonides, published by David Nutt, London, 1859. Dräseke treats this document with much more respect than it deserves, and even Hilgenfeld thinks that it may contain something of value. Harnack thinks it well, therefore, at once to point out the marks of forgery which present themselves to him. This he does with great force and very convincingly—Jahn, Alb. Des Heil. Eustathius Beurtheilung des Origenes betreffend die Auffassung der Wahrsagerin I. Kön. [Sam.] 28 (F. H. Reusch). This treatise is one of the scanty monuments of the obscure beginning of the attack on Origen, though in itself, in relation to the exegetical problem, of no importance. The text both of Eustathius and of Origen's Homily which he criticises has hitherto rested mainly on the *Editio Princeps* of Leo Allazzi, taken from a very faulty Vatican MS. Thanks are due to Jahn for his edition, which is founded upon all the printed editions, and on the Codex Monacensis Graecus 331, now used for the first time. Jahn's text of the Homily of Origen certainly renders all previous texts obsolete, but he has taken far too little pains in the emendation of Origen from the citations of Eustathius; he has done very little for the explanation of the matter which he has edited; he has given no index of any kind; and his introduction contains nothing of any value which is not found in Huet and Delarue.

Theologisch. Tijdschrift, xxi. 3. May 1887. Dr. Völter in a long article called Ignatius-Peregrinus, written in German, endeavours to shew (1) that the Ignatian Epistles are all with the exception of the Epistle to the Romans 'genuine'; (2) that the 'genuine' six are really the work of Lucian and Peregrinus, and identical with the epistles ascribed to him by Lucian in C. 41 (*φασί δὲ πάσαις σχεδὸν ταῖς ἐνδόξοις πόλεσιν ἐπιστολὰς διαπέμψαι αὐτόν, διαθήκας τινὰς καὶ παραινέσεις καὶ νόμους*); (3) that with the expulsion of Peregrinus from the Church they lost their popularity, and were afterwards at the time of the Montanist movement re-edited with the name of Ignatius substituted for that of Peregrinus by a diascenest who also wrote the Epistle to the Romans, in which the author is first represented as a Bishop, and introduced into the remaining epistles 'die Vorstellung das der Briefschreiber auf dem Transport nach Rom sich befinde'. Review: Die synoptischen evangelien nach der Form ihres inhaltes von C. Holsten by Dr. W. C. van Manen. (Favourable.)

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

BOOKS PUBLISHED IN ENGLAND.

- Ainger* (A. C.) and *Wittle* (H. G.) Eton Latin Grammar. Part I. Accidence and Syntax Rules for use in Preparatory Schools. Svo. 106 pp. London. Murray. 2s.
- Caesar*. Gallic War. Book VII. Edited for the use of Schools by Rev. J. Bond and A. S. Walpole. With Notes and Vocabulary. 18mo. 116 pp. London. Macmillan. 1s. 6d.
- Cicero*. Cato Maior sive de Senectute, edited by E. W. Howson. 12mo. xvi. 79 pp. London. Rivington. 2s.
- Speeches against Catiline. With Introduction and Notes by E. A. Upcott. 8vo. 120 pp. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 2s. 6d.
- Clyde* (J.) The Modern Latin Grammar for the use of Schools. Composed with constant reference to the Elucidation of the Latin Element in English. Part I. Elementary. 16mo. 166 pp. Edinburgh. Oliver and Boyd. 2s.
- Compton* (W. C.) Rudiments of Attic Construction and Idiom: an Introduction to Greek Syntax for beginners who have acquired some knowledge of Latin. 12mo. viii. 87 pp. Cambridge. Deighton Bell. 3s.
- Herodotus*. Book IX. Ch. I.-LXXXIX. (Plataea). With Introduction and Notes by E. S. Schueckburgh. Cr. Svo. 229 pp. Cambridge. Pitt Press. 3s. 6d.
- Holden* (F. T.) Tripertita. 3rd Series. A Course of easy Latin Exercises for Preparatory Schools, arranged to suit the threefold division of the year. 12mo. 246 pp. London. Rivington. 3s.
- Howell* (H. W.) The right method of studying the Greek and Latin Classics: The Chancellor's Essay, 1887. Svo. 22 pp. Oxford. Blackwell. 1s.
- Ironsides* (G.) Rudimenta analytica. Part I. The simple sentence. An easy and carefully-graduated First Latin Course, containing Grammar, Word-building, Exercises, and Vocabulary for the use of Schools. Cr. Svo. x. 255 pp. London. Simpkin. 3s. 6d.
- Kynersley* (H. W. S.) Latin Exercises. Second Edition, with Vocabulary arranged in alphabetical order of the more elementary portions of the work entitled Latin Prose Composition. Svo. 160 pp. London. Relfe. 2s.
- Lucan* Pharsalia, edited with English Notes by C. E. Haskins, with an Introduction by W. E. Heitland. Svo. exxx. 393 pp. London. Bell. 14s.
- Morice* (F. D.) Greek Passages adapted for practice in Unseen Translation for Middle and Higher Forms of School. 12mo. vi. 124 pp. London. Rivington. 2s. 6d.
- Nettleship* (H.) Passages for translation into Latin Prose. With an Introduction. Cr. Svo. vi. 135 pp. London. Bell. 3s.
- Ovid*. Easy selections from Ovid in Elegiac Verse. With Notes, Vocabulary, and Exercises in Latin Verse Composition by H. Wilkinson. 18mo. 116 pp. London. Macmillan. 1s. 6d.
- Stories from the Metamorphoses. Selected and Edited with Notes, Exercises, and Vocabulary by J. Bond and A. S. Walpole. 18mo. 90 pp. London. Macmillan. 1s. 6d.
- Plato*. Meno, with Introduction and Notes by St. George Stock. 12mo. London. Frowde. 2s. 6d.
- Rawlinson* (G.) Ancient History. Cr. Svo. xiii. 352 pp. London. Deacon. 7s. 6d.
- Stedman* (A. M. M.) Easy Latin Passages for Unseen Translation. 12mo. 72 pp. London. Bell. 1s. 6d.
- Virgil*. Aeneid I. edited with Introduction and Notes by C. S. Jerram. 16mo. xxxix. 43 pp. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1s. 6d.

BOOKS PUBLISHED ON THE CONTINENT.

- Adams* (W.) De ablativi absoluti apud Q. Curtium Rufum usu. Svo. 56 pp. Arnsberg. Stein. 1 Mk.
- Aristophanis* comoediae. Annotatione critica, commentario exegetico et scholiis graecis instruit F. H. M. Blaydes. Pars VII. Acharnenses. Svo. xx. 509 pp. Halle. Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses. 10 Mk. (I.-VII. 50 Mk.)
- Aristotelis* opera omnia quae extant, brevi paraphrasi et litterae perpetuo inhaerente expositione illustrata a Silv. Mauro, S. J. Tom. IV. De Anima, Parva Naturalia, Metaphysica. Ed. Aug. Bräunemann, S. J. Roy. Svo. 656 pp. Paris. Lethielleux.
- Ausfeld* (R.) De libro περί του πάντα σπουδαίων εἶναι ἐκείθεν qui inter Philonis Alexandrini opera fertur. Svo. 58 pp. Göttingen. Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 1 Mk. 60.
- Ausone, Sidoine Apollinaire et Fortunat*. Oeuvres complètes, traduites par E. F. Corpet, E. Barret, Ch. Nisard. Avec le texte latin. Roy. Svo. v. 817 pp. Paris. Didot. 10 francs.
- Bechtel* (F.) Die Inschriften des ionischen Dialekts. 4to. viii. 154 pp. mit 5 Tafeln. Göttingen. Dieterich. 8 Mk.
- Belsham* (J.) Codex (f²) Corbiensis sive quatuor evangelia ante Hieronymum latine translata. E codice membranaceo quinto vel sexto saeculo, ut videtur, scripto qui in Bibl. Nat. Paris. asservatur, nunc primum ed. J. B. Svo. viii. 127 pp. Christiania. Aschehoug. 3 Mk. 50.
- Blancard* (L.) Sur quelques noms osques d'Espagne et d'Italie. Svo. 10 pp. Marseilles.
- Théorie de la monnaie romaine au 3^e siècle après J.-C. Svo. 10 pp. Marseilles.
- Blass* (Fr.) Die attische Beredsamkeit. Abth. 1. Von Gorgias bis zu Lysias. 2. Aufl. Svo. vii. 648 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 14 Mk.
- Naturalismus und Materialismus in Griechenland in Platon's Zeit. Svo. 19 pp. Kiel. Univ. Buchh. 1 Mk.
- Böcker* (F.) Damme als der mutmassliche Schauplatz der Varusschlacht, sowie der Kämpfe bei den Pontes longi im Jahre 15 und der Römer mit den Germanen am Agrivarierwalle im Jahre 16. Svo. 72 pp. 2 pl. Cologne. Bachem. 1 Mk. 75.
- Bruuk* (A.) De excerptis περί του των ήρώων καθ' Ομηρον βίου ab Athenaeo servatis. Svo. 39 pp. Greifswald. 75 Pf.
- Caesaris* (C.) Julii, de bello gallico commentarii VII. cum commentario VIII A. Hirtii. Rec. H. Walther. Svo. xx. 188 pp. Paderborn. F. Schöningh. 1 Mk. 20 Pf.
- Cicero*. Discours contre Verrès. Seconde action. Livre 6. De Signis. Texte Latin publié d'après les travaux les plus récents, avec un commentaire critique et explicatif, une introduction, un index et des cartes par E. Thomas. Svo. 140 pp. 2 maps. Paris. Hachette. 4 frs.
- Traité des devoirs (livre 1^{er}). Traduction française précédée d'une introduction sur la morale stoïcienne et la morale de Cicéron par E. Maillet. 12mo. xli. 74 pp. Paris. Belin.
- Tusculanarum disputationum ad M. Brutum libri V. Erklärt von Dr. G. Fischer. Bd. 2. Buch III.-V. 8^{te} Aufl. von G. Sorof. Svo. 172 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. 1 Mk. 50.
- Collignon* (M.) Le combat d'Erechthée et d'Immarados sur une tessère grecque en plomb. Svo.

- 9 pp. (*extr.* Mém. de la Soc. Nat. des Antiquaires de France).
- Commentationes philologicae in honorem sodalitii philologorum Gryphiswaldensis secundum lustrum scripserunt veteres sodales.* 8vo. 67 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. 1 Mk. 60.
- Croiset (A. et M.) Histoire de la littérature grecque.* Vol. I. Homère—La poésie cyclique—Hésiode par M. Croiset. 8vo. xxxvi. 601 pp. Paris. Thorin. 8 frs.
- Cucuel (C.) Quid sibi cui Cratylus inscribitur proposuerit Plato.* 8vo. 64 pp. Paris. Leroux. 3 frs. 50 c.
- *Essai sur la langue et le style de l'orateur Antiphon.* 8vo. ix. 145 pp. Paris. Leroux. 5 frs.
- Curtius (E.) Griechische Geschichte.* 1. Bd. Bis zum Beginne der Perserkriege. 6. verbesserte Aufl. 8vo. vii. 701 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. 8 Mk.
- Demosthenis de Corona Oratio in usum scholarum iterum edidit J. H. Lipsius.* 8vo. vi. 120 pp. Leipzig. Teubner.
- Didascalia CCCXVIII patrum pseudepigrapha e graceis codicibus recensuit P. Batiffol, Coptico contulit H. Hyvernati.* 8vo. 21 pp. Paris. Leroux. 3 frs.
- Didymi de Aristarchea Odysseae recensione reliquiarum Supplementum ab A. Ludwich editum.* 4to. 10 pp. Königsberg. Schubert und Seidel. 20 Pf.
- Dielitz (Th.) Homerische Formenlehre. Ein Repetitionsbuch für Gymnasien.* 8vo. 24 pp. Altenburg. Pierer. 40 Pf.
- Eckstein (F. A.) Lateinischer und griechischer Unterricht.* Mit einem Vorwort von Dr. W. Schrader. Herausgeg. von Dr. H. Heyden. 8vo. xiii. 501 pp. Leipzig. Fues. 9 Mk.
- Edet (G.) Histoire sommaire de la littérature grecque.* 16mo. viii. 368 pp. Paris. Hachette. 3 frs.
- Feilchenfeld (A.) De Vergilii Bucolicorum temporibus.* 8vo. 48 pp. Berlin. Mayer und Müller.
- Fischer (W.) Gegen den Homer Kultus in unseren Schulen.* 8vo. 24 pp. Leipzig. Siegmund und Volkening. 60 Pf.
- Flach (J.) Der Hellenismus der Zukunft.* 12mo. 51 pp. Leipzig. Friedrich. 1 Mk.
- *Klassizismus oder Materialismus.* 2. Ausg. 8vo. 49 pp. Leipzig. Reissner. 1 Mk.
- Fritzsche (H.) Kurzgefasste griechische Schulgrammatik. Teil 2. Syntax.* 8vo. vii. 50 pp. Hannover. Norddeutsche Verlags-Anstalt. 60 Pf.
- Führer durch die Ruinen von Pergamon.* Hrsg. von der Generalverwaltung der königl. Museum zu Berlin. 12mo. 27 pp. and 2 Pläne and 1 Abbildung. Berlin. Spemann. 60 Pf.
- Geppert (P.) Zum Monumentum Ancyranum.* 4to. 18 pp. Berlin. Gaertner. 1 Mk.
- Goetz (G.) De Sisebuti carmine.* 4to. 8 pp. Jena. Neuenhahn. 50 Pf.
- Goetzler (L.) De Polybi clocutione.* 8vo. iv. 47 pp. Würzburg. Stahel. 1 Mk. 60.
- Greulich. Dionysius Halicarnassensis quibus potissimum ex artibus metaphorice ductis in scriptis rhetoricis usus sit.* 8vo. 46 pp. Breslau. Köhler. 1 Mk.
- Grimmelt (B.) De republicae Platonis compositione et unitate.* 8vo. 102 pp. Berlin. Weber. 1 Mk. 20.
- Grollmus (M.) De M. Tullio Cicerone poeta.* I. De inscriptionibus, de argumentis, de temporibus singulorum carminum. 8vo. 56 pp. Königsberg. 1 Mk. 50.
- Guérin. Etude sur Juvénal avec une traduction complète en vers français et des notes.* 8vo. 347 pp. Paris. Cerf. 7 fr. 50 c.
- Haake (A.) Die Gesellschaftslehre der Stoiker.* 4to. 22 pp. Berlin. Calvary and Co. 1 Mk. 60.
- Haefler (E.) Die Erbtochter nach attischem Recht.* 8vo. x. 91 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk. 50.
- Hartmann (L. M.) De exilio apud Romanos inde ab initio bellorum civilium usque ad Severi Alexandri principatum.* 8vo. 63 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. 1 Mk. 20.
- Heidenhain (F.) Die Arten der Tragoedie bei Aristoteles.* II. III. 4to. 40 pp. Berlin. Mayer et Müller. 1 Mk.
- Helbig (W.) Das homerische Epos, aus den Denkmälern erläutert. Archaeologische Untersuchungen.* 2. verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage. Mit 2 Tafeln und 163 in den Text gedruckten Abbildungen. 8vo. x. 470 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 12 Mk. 80.
- Herhold (L.) Lateinischer Wort und Gedankenschatz. Ein Hilfs- und Nachschlagebuch der hauptsächlichsten latein. Ausdrücke, Spruchwörter, Citate, Devisen, Inschriften, etc., nebst deutscher Uebersetzung.* 8vo. vii. 280 pp. Hannover. Hahn. 4 Mk.
- Hertzberg (G.) Histoire de la Grèce sous la domination des Romains, traduite de l'allemand sous la direction d'A. Bouché-Leclercq.* Vol. I. 8vo. xvi. 494 pp. Paris. Leroux. 10 frs.
- Hesiod's Gedichte in ihrer ursprünglichen Fassung und Sprachform wiederhergestellt.* Mit einem Anhang über die Versabzählung in den homerischen Epen. 8vo. 131 pp. Göttingen. Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 4 Mk.
- Hildebrandt (A.) Studien auf dem Gebiete der römischen Poesie und Metrik.* I. Vergils Culex. 8vo. vii. 176 pp. 1 pl. Leipzig, Zangenberg und Himly. 2 Mk. 40.
- Homer. Iliade, erklärt von J. U. Faesi.* Band IV. Gesang IX.—XXIV. 6. Aufl. von F. R. Franke. 8vo. 248 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. 1 Mk. 80.
- *Ilias.* Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von K. F. Ameis. 2. Band. 3. Hft. Gesang XIX. XXI. Bearbeitet von C. Hentze. 2. Aufl. 8vo. Leipzig. Teubner. 1 Mk. 20.
- Dasselbe. Anhang. 3. Hft. Erläuterungen zu Gesang VIII.—IX. von C. Hentze. 2. Aufl. 1 Mk. 80.
- Horace. Horatius christianus, seu Horatii odæ a scandalis expurgatae, a scopulis expeditae et sale christiano conditae, a J. F. Bergier.* 32mo. 164 pp. Salins.
- Jezienicki (M.) Ueber die Abfassungszeit der Platonischen Dialoge Theaetet und Sophistes.* 8vo. 49 pp. Lemberg. Milikowski. 1 Mk. 20.
- Johansson (K. F.) De derivatis verbis contractis linguae graecae quaestiones.* 8vo. iv. 218 pp. Upsala. Akadem. Buchhandlung. 6 Mk.
- Jordan (H.) Die Könige im alten Italien. Ein Fragment.* 8vo. xi. 47 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. Mk. 2.
- Juvénal. Les satires, traduites en vers par P. Ducos. Accompagnées du texte latin et de remarques extraites de la traduction de M. de Silveane (1690).* 8vo. 543 pp. Paris. Perrin. 7 fr. 50 c.
- Kaerst (J.) Forschungen zur Geschichte Alexanders des Grossen.* 8vo. vii. 144 pp. Stuttgart. Kohlhammer. 1 Mk. 80.
- Kammer (E.) Kritisch-aesthetische Untersuchungen, betr. die Gesänge M, N, Ξ, O, der Ilias.* 8vo. 105 pp. Königsberg. Hartung. 1 Mk. 50.
- Klaucke (P.) Aufgaben zum Uebersetzen aus dem Deutschen ins Griechische für obere Klassen.* 8vo. viii. 180 pp. Berlin. W. Weber. 2 Mk. 40.
- Klinko. Quaestiones Aeschineae criticae.* 8vo. 82 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk. 50.
- Knaack (Dr. G.) Callimachea.* 4to. 16 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. 1 Mk. 20.
- Koch (E.) Übungsbuch zur griechischen Formenlehre.* Heft I. 8vo. vi. 114 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 1 Mk.
- Korb (F. H.) Lateinische Übungssätze zur Casuslehre aus Q. Curtius Rufus, im Anschlusse an die lateinische Schulgrammatik von K. Schmidt und die Memorabilia Alexandri Magni von K. Schmidt und O. Gehlen zusammengestellt.* 8vo. iv. 42 pp. Prag. Dominicus. 60 Pf.
- Krafft (M.) Zur Wortstellung Vergils.* 4to. 38 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk.
- Krebs. Antibarbarus der lateinischen Sprache.* 6.

- Auflage in vollständiger Umarbeitung der von Altgayer besorgten 5. Ausgabe von J. H. Schmalz. Lief. 4. and 5. Bd. I. pp. 401-744. 8vo. Basel. Schwabe, each 2 Mk.
- (F.) Zur Rection der Casus in der späteren historischen Gracität. I. 8vo. 24 pp. Munich. Lindauer. 1 Mk.
- Kuhlmann (L.) Quaestiones Sallustianae criticae. 4to. 40 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk. 50.
- Livius. Liber V. erklärt von Luterbacher. 8vo. iii. 111 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 1 Mk. 20.
- Luebbert (E.) Commentatio de Pindaricorum carminum compositione ex Nomorum historia illustranda. 4to. 19 pp. Bonn. Cohen. 1 Mk.
- Commentatio de Pindaro dogmatis de migratione animarum cultore. 4to. 21 pp. Bonn. Cohen. 1 Mk.
- Commentatio de Pindari studiis chronologicis 4to. 28 pp. Bonn. Cohen. 1 Mk.
- Lupus (B.) Die Stadt Syrakus im Alterthum. Autorisirte deutsche Bearbeitung der Cavallari-Holmschen Topografia archeologica di Siracusa. 8vo. xii. 343 pp. mit Illustrationen und zwei Karten. Strassburg. Heitz. 10 Mk.
- Majewski (R.) De subjectionis et occupationis formis, quae inveniuntur apud Demosthenem. 8vo. 12 pp. Königsberg. Hartung. 30 Pf.
- Mayer (M.) Die Giganten und Titanen in der antiken Sage und Kunst. Mit 2 Tafeln und in den Text gedruckten Abbildungen. 8vo. vi. 414 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. 10 Mk.
- Meusel (H.) Lexicon Caesarianum. Fasc. VIII. Roy. 8vo. Pp. 1345-1544. Berlin. Weber. 2 Mk. 40 (Vol. I. cpltd. 13 Mk. 20).
- Mommsen (T.) Beiträge zu der Lehre von den griechischen Praepositionen. 2. u. 3. Heft. 8vo. P. 97-288. Frankfurt. Jügel. 4 Mk. 80 (1-3. 7 Mk. 20).
- Mücke (R.) Zu Arrians und Epiktets Sprachgebrauch. 4to. 35 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk.
- Platonis dialogi secundum Thrasylli tetralogias dispositi. Post C. F. Hermannum recognovit M. Wohlrab. Vol. I. 12mo. xlii. 551 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 1 Mk. 80.
- Plauti Comoediae recensuit, instrumento critico et prolegomenis auxit F. Ritschl, sociis operae adsumptis G. Loewe, G. Goetz, F. Schoell. Vol. III. fasc. III. : Rudens. 8vo. xxvi. 188 pp. Leipzig. Teubner.
- Pluzanski. Aristotelea de natura astrorum opinio ejusque vices apud philosophos tum antiquos tum medii aevi. 8vo. 145 pp. Paris. Thorin.
- Reiter (A.) De Ammiani Marcellini usu orationis obliquae. 8vo. 78 pp. Amberg. Habel. 1 Mk. 20.
- Reitzenstein (R.) Verrianische Forschungen. 8vo. viii. 116 pp. Breslau. Köbner. 1 Mk. 80.
- Reuchardt (G.) De praepositionum usu apud Ammianum. 8vo. 62 pp. Cöthen. Schettler. 1 Mk.
- Ribbeck (O.) Geschichte der römischen Dichtung. I. Dichtung der Republik. 8vo. vii. 348 pp. Stuttgart. Cotta. 7 Mk.
- Rösch (H.) Semasiologische Beiträge zum lateinischen Wörterbuch. Heft. 1. Substantiva. 8vo. 78 pp. Leipzig. Fues. 2 Mk. 40.
- Rosbach (A.) u. Westphal (R.) Theorie der musischen Künste der Hellenen. Bd. 3. Abth. 1. Allgemeine Theorie der griechischen Metrik von R. Westphal u. H. Gleditsch. Nebst einem Nachwort zum 2. Bde. XLVI. 368 pp. 8vo. Leipzig. Teubner. 8 Mk. (I.-III. 1. 22 Mk.).
- Schaezel (L.) Plinius der Jüngere und Cassiodorus Senator. Kritische Beiträge zum 10. Buch der Briefe und zu den Briefen. 4to. 36 pp. Darmstadt. Winter. 80 Pf.
- Schäfer (A.) Demosthenes und seine Zeit. 2nd revised edition. Vol. III. 8vo. x. 496 pp. 1 plate. Leipzig. Teubner. 10 Mk.
- Schimmelpfeng (G.) Orationes quae sunt in Macartatum (XLIII.) et in Olympiodorum (XLVIII.) et in Laceriti exceptionem (XXXV.) sub Demosthenis nomine traditae nunc unius ejus denique oratoris esse judicandae sint. 8vo. 68 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk. 50.
- Schmidt (F. W.) Kritische Studien zu den griechischen Dramatikern, nebst e. Anhang zur Kritik der Anthologie. Bd. 3. (Zu den kleineren Tragikern, den Adespota, den Komikern und der Anthologie.) 8vo. iii. 236 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. 7 Mk. cpltd. 29 Mk.
- Schnepf (M.) De imitationis ratione quae intercedit inter Heliodorum et Xenophontem Ephesium commentatio. 8vo. 42 pp. Kempten. Kösel. 1 Mk.
- Schutze (W.) Quaestionum Homericarum specimen. 8vo. 55 pp. Greifswald. 1 Mk.
- Scribonii Largi compositiones edidit G. Helmreich. 12mo. viii. 123 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 1 Mk. 80.
- Script (O.) De Polybii Olympiadum ratione et de bello punico primo quaestiones chronologicae. 8vo. 50 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk.
- Simon (J. A.) Xenophon Studien. I. Zur Entwicklung des Xenophontischen Stils. 4to. 32 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 2 Mk.
- Sittl (K.) Geschichte der griechischen Literatur bis auf Alexander den Grossen. Teil. 3. Mit Generalregister. 8vo. vi. 521. München. Th. Ackermann. 6 Mk. 50. (cpltd. 17 Mk. 80.)
- Sollau (F.) Zur Erklärung der Sprache des Volkes der Seythen in Anhalt an die über die Sitten und die Sprache dieses Volkes im Geschichtswerke des Herodot gegebenen Mittheilungen. 8vo. 54 pp. Berlin. Stargardt. 1 Mk.
- Susemihl (F.) De Platonis Phaedro et Isocratis contra Sophistas oratione. Adiecta est appendix Aristotelica. 4to. 16 pp. Greifswald. 1 Mk. 80.
- Taciti (C.) ab excessu divi Augusti libri. In usum scholarum rec. Prof. M. Gittlbauer. Book I.-VI. 12mo. viii. 253 pp. Freiburg. Herder. 1 Mk. 20.
- Tenence. Comédies. Traduction nouvelle par G. Hinstin avec le texte Latin. Tome I. 16mo. viii. 440 pp. Paris. Lemerre. 5 frs.
- Heeyra. Textelatin. Avec commentaire critique et explicatif par P. Thomas. 8vo. iv. 108 pp. Paris. 3 f. 50 c.
- Theophylacti Simocattae historiae, ed. Carol. de Boor. 12mo. xiv. 437 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 6 Mk.
- Thomaskirk (P.) De Lysiae epithographi authentia verisimili. 8vo. 44 pp. Breslau. Köhler. 1 Mk.
- Tractatus Harleianus qui dicitur de metris editus a G. Studemund. 4to. 29 pp. Breslau. Köhler. 75 Pf.
- Treiber (O.) Geschichte der Lykier. Mit einer von H. Kiepert entworfenen chromolith. Karte. 8vo. viii. 247 pp. Stuttgart. Kohlhammer. 5 Mk.
- Vitae sanctorum metricae IX. Ex codicibus Monacensibus, Parisiensibus, Bruxellensi, Hagensi saec. IX.-XII. ed. G. Harster. 12mo. xvi. 237. Leipzig. Teubner. 3 Mk.
- Voigt (M.) Ueber die Staatsrechtliche possessio und den ager compascuus der römischen Republik. (Estr. Abh. d. Kgl. Säch. Ges. d. Wiss.). Roy. 8vo. Pp. 225-272. Leipzig. Hirzel. 2 Mk.
- Völker (E.) Rhintonis fragmenta. 8vo. 49 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 90 Pf.
- Volkman (W.) Studien Aleiphrona. I. De Aleiphrona comoediae imitatore. 8vo. 44 pp. Breslau. Köhler. 1 Mk.
- Wilhelm (F.) De Minucii Felicis Octavio et Tertuliano Apologetico. 8vo. 86 pp.
- Zielinski, Th. Quaestiones comicae. I. Epirrhematium. II. De comoediae Palaesticae reliquis. II. De comoediae Doricae personis. IV. De Menaechorum paramythia. V. De Aeca Larentia. 8vo. 126 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 2 Mk.

The Classical Review

NOVEMBER 1887.

GEORG CURTIUS.

Georg Curtius. Ein Charakteristik von E. WINDISCH. Berlin. Calvary and Co. 1887. pp. 56. Mk. 2.40.

THE short pamphlet by Professor Windisch is a welcome addition to the memorials of his revered master. Dr. Angermann in the tenth volume of Bezzenberger's *Beiträge* has given an interesting sketch of the life and the personal influence of Georg Curtius. His elder brother, Professor Ernst Curtius, has prefixed to the first volume of the *Kleine Schriften* of the deceased scholar a charming picture of him as he appeared to one of the comparatively few who were honoured with a close and affectionate intimacy. But there was still room, and indeed there was a real demand, for an account of his scientific work, from a sympathetic but not a partisan's standpoint; and this has been well given us by Dr. Windisch. There was a demand for this, because unquestionably the tendency of the most advanced school in comparative philology has been to lay undue stress upon those parts of the work of Curtius which may now appear to be antiquated, to bring into prominence points of difference rather than those of agreement, and to ignore or pass over lightly contributions to the development of the science which were of real value. From these faults the memorial sketch by Dr. Windisch is entirely free. He does not disguise the extent to which he differs from some of Curtius's conclusions. He does not deny the value of some of the more recent theories, to which Curtius never gave his assent. But he brings out clearly the full significance of his work and his personal influence as a whole; and rightly lays stress upon it as an essential factor in the history of his favourite science.

The most important service that Curtius rendered was one which no man could have done who was not, as he was from the be-

ginning to the end of his career, in the first place a classical scholar. Schleicher, with all his wide linguistic attainments, was not this even in the second place. He was at heart a Darwinian botanist, who handled language as if it were the subject-matter of natural and not of historical science. His services are not to be underrated, obsolete as are many of his results. But it could never have been said of him, as Dr. Windisch well says of Curtius, that he first brought two great sciences into a mutually helpful relation to one another. Curtius was not a student of language, availing himself of the aid of Latin and Greek to attack the general questions of linguistics, but a classical scholar, studying the languages of Greece and Rome in the light of comparative philology. It was very significant that his first important work was dedicated (1846) to Lassen and Ritschl. In the earlier part of his career, his lectures extended over a wide field of Greek and Latin literature. To the last he retained his interest in the literary as well as the purely grammatical study of the ancient authors. Hence few men were better fitted to maintain the connexion between the two sides of philology, which cannot be parted without serious loss to both. He never appeared as leading an irruption of comparative philology into the territory of scholarship, but rather as welcoming its aid in a field to which much of his own labour was devoted. He was always proud to be a classical scholar, and whatever he could learn from the comparison of other languages was always brought to bear upon the explanation of the structure of those with which he was immediately concerned. Sometimes he was taunted with not having a wide enough command of languages for a comparative philologist; but for the work which he had to do, a thorough knowledge of the classical tongues, combined with the power to follow adequately what others

were doing in cognate languages, was what was most necessary, and this never failed him.

Dr. Windisch shows well how it was the instinct, or call it, if you please, the prejudice of a classical scholar, which made him cling to the notion of a Graeco-Italic unity, after the scientific basis of this theory was really destroyed.

Not that Curtius was without a keen sense of the mysterious nature and vitality of language, and of the fascination of the more abstract problems which it presents. But he never lost himself in details, and hence, while he contributed less than some of his contemporaries by special investigations, no one was better fitted to survey the general progress of his science, and to sum up its total gains at any particular time. This is what gives to his *Grundzüge* the character which, as Dr. Windisch justly says, even his opponents allow to it, that of one of the most valuable and useful works on the science of language. The successive editions of it showed how ready he was to learn as well as to teach; and a comparison of the eleventh section of his Introduction in the first and in the fifth edition gives a vivid conception of the progress of the science during the years which separated them.

Dr. Windisch rightly regards the year 1873, in which the second edition of Curtius's *Zur Chronologie*, and the first volume of *Das Verbum der Griechischen Sprache* appeared, as the last in which the clear majority of competent scholars was decidedly on the side of Bopp and his school, the last in which Curtius could hold his favourite position as the representative of a general *consensus*. When, four years later, a second edition of the latter work appeared, it was already, though far too harshly, pronounced to be antiquated. In a sense it will never be antiquated. It sums up in a final form the results of a certain method, which long held sway in philology, and it marks the utmost progress attained along certain lines. To advance further, the problem had to be attacked in an entirely different fashion; and for this the materials collected by Curtius gave the most valuable help. But both as a writer and as a teacher he reached at this time his zenith. His pupils were even more numerous than those of his illustrious colleague Ritschl, and in the winter of 1874 his lectures on Greek Grammar were attended by 273 students. This date happens to mark the completion of his twenty-fifth year as a professor; when the foundation of the *Curtius-Stiftung* by contributions from all parts of the civilized world showed the honour in which he was held.

From that year a certain decline in his personal and scientific influence may be dated. In 1868 Scherer in his *Zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache* had protested against the undue limitation of philology to the merely mechanical aspect of phonetic changes, and had called for more attention to the psychical processes underlying the development of languages. At the same time, and in close connexion with this, he had urged that the only safe basis for the theoretical reconstruction of the earlier forms of speech was the careful study of the forces at work in the periods more directly and intimately known to us. His protests told more immediately upon the method of Schleicher than on that of Curtius; but the two scholars belonged essentially to the same school, and the teaching of the latter did not pass unchallenged. The view *e.g.* that the Sanskrit *bhārāmi* was the representative of a primitive *bharāmi*, from which *φέρω*, *fero*, &c., were derived, was directly denied by Scherer. He maintained that the primitive form was *bharā*, and that *bhārāmi* was a later form due to the analogy of verbs like *dādāmi*. The operation of analogy was universally admitted in modern languages. He insisted that it should be no less fully recognised as at work in the ancient languages, even in comparatively early stages. Of the younger scholars it was Leskien in Leipzig who took up most warmly the views of Scherer, and urged them, both in lectures and in private conversation, on those of his own generation. So was formed by degrees the school of the 'young grammarians.' Their cardinal principles were (1) that phonetic laws, so far as they act mechanically, admit of no exceptions; (2) that the 'association of forms' in all stages of the history of a language has led to changes due to a false analogy. Both these principles were applied with a rigour and consistency which led to very different results from those which had been generally accepted. Curtius, for example, had endeavoured to bring as many as possible of the letter-changes in Greek under the heading of regular laws. But he had devoted quite half of his *Grundzüge* to the discussion of what he called 'sporadic' or 'irregular' letter changes. The very existence of such sporadic changes, except so far as they were dialectic, was now denied. 'Analogy' was pressed into the service, to account for all phenomena which did not agree with regular laws. The boldness and consistency with which Curtius's younger colleague Brugmann applied these principles in a famous article on the *Nasalis sonans*, published in the ninth volume of Curtius's

Studien, showed clearly how far the new school was ready to push its dissent from currently received conclusions, and made it impossible for that series of studies to be continued as a joint publication. In 1878 and the following years Brugmann and Osthoff published four volumes of *Morphologische Untersuchungen*, in which various problems of etymology and inflexion were attacked with remarkable learning and ingenuity. The views of the new school were really only an expansion and a natural outcome of the principles for which Curtius had long been contending. But it was only natural that he should be slow to accept the far-reaching modifications of his explanation of many details which they seemed to entail. It was not less natural that his caution and sobriety should appear timorous to many who were fascinated by the boldness of the younger philologists, and that his teaching should seem to be antiquated. His attitude in face of the new doctrines was thoroughly dignified, and worthy of his high position. No element of personal bitterness, no jealousy or irritability, for which his severe physical sufferings at this time might have served as some excuse, was ever allowed to interfere with his calm consideration of his young opponents' theories. Wherever he was able to recognise any well-established contribution to science, he accepted it gladly, and the fifth edition of his *Grundzüge* (reproduced in the second edition of the English translation) showed how ready he was to incorporate all changes which convinced his judgment. For nine years he contented himself with watching the development of the new doctrines, and occasionally uttering a warning against premature or extravagant conclusions, which their champions seemed to be advancing. At last in 1885 he published his *Zur Kritik der neuesten Sprachforschung*, in which he attempted a more systematic and complete criticism of the newer philology as a whole. It cannot be denied that in this brief, but most pregnant, treatise, he hit not a few weak points in the doctrines now rapidly becoming popular. But the work was essentially one of reconciliation. It had been common to speak of the new views as amounting to a 'catastrophe' in the history of comparative philology. Curtius showed that after all the movement in advance—and he did not deny for a moment that it was in advance—was proceeding along lines which had been laid down by the founders of the science, and that the appearance of discord had arisen, at least in part, from an undue stress

upon the physical aspect of language, and a neglect of its historical development. On the other hand it must be admitted that Curtius hardly realised the full force of the arguments in support of the new views, and Brugmann's rejoinder, appended to his inaugural address as Professor of Comparative Philology at Freiburg, was a masterly and conclusive defence of the positions taken up by the school of which he is now one of the foremost representatives. Not only on the general questions of the action of phonetic laws, and of the far-reaching influence of analogy, did he show that his views were a legitimate and consistent development of principles which Curtius himself had admitted; but also with regard to the varied vocalisation of the primitive Indo-Germanic stock, and the untrustworthy character of much of the analysis of inflexions commonly taught, he gained an unquestioned victory. A teacher who now contents himself with reproducing the doctrines of Schleicher and Curtius, as they were all but universally accepted ten years back, ought to be aware that he has been left far behind by the progress of his science, and that much of his teaching will consist of baseless theories and exploded speculations, while even what is correct will be lacking in the unity of a rigorous and accurate method.

But admitting this to the full, the place of Curtius is none the less assured in the history of comparative philology. For thirty years he stood in the very forefront of those who were leading the advance. His original contributions were not numerous, and some of those which appeared at the time the most valuable have been set aside by more recent researches. But no one of his contemporaries was guided in his inquiries by a finer instinct; no one had a fuller knowledge of the work that was being done in the philological field, or examined its results with a more sober and vigilant criticism, or gathered them into a more attractive and intelligible form; no one finally had a deeper influence on the pupils that gathered in such numbers around him, or inspired them with a purer delight in that pursuit of truth to which his own blameless and exemplary life was devoted. It will be long before the scientific value of his works shall be exhausted; but when, in the progress of the study, for which he did so much, that day arrives, they will still retain their interest as marking an important stage in its development, and as models of sound learning, clear statement, and judicial sobriety.

A. S. WILKINS.

SCHILLER'S HISTORY OF THE EMPIRE.

Geschichte der Römischen Kaiserzeit. By Prof. SCHILLER. Band II. Gotha. 1887. 9 Mk.

No one who reads Prof. Schiller's history will be inclined to underestimate either his learning, or the amount of conscientious study which he has devoted to his subject. But he has no mercy on his readers, and we fear that for all but the strongest digestions this volume, like that which preceded it, will prove too tough a morsel. The truth is that he has produced not so much a history, as a collection of the materials for a history. The value of his work lies in the mass of facts which he has brought together and in the fulness of his references, alike to the ancient authorities and to the modern literature, while it is in the selection and grouping of his facts that he fails. Too often we cannot see the wood for the trees, and the general outlines and distinctive features of the period are constantly obscured by the mass of details. These defects are the more unfortunate because the period with which this volume deals, that from Diocletian to Theodosius, is at once one of the most important, and the most difficult of comprehension in ancient history. It moreover stands in great need of a historian. Tillemont, laborious and learned as he was, worked with inadequate materials, and with a very imperfect grasp of the chief problems of the time, while Gibbon's treatment of this period is on the whole the least satisfactory part of his great work. Since Gibbon wrote, although much has been done in special departments—and notably in all that concerns the movements of the barbarian peoples—there has been, if we except the necessarily brief sketch in Ranke's *Weltgeschichte*, and the rather superficial account given by Duruy, no serious attempt made at a history of the time as a whole, and this want Prof. Schiller has only partially supplied.

The volume opens, rightly enough, with a section on the authorities—which in itself affords a good illustration of Prof. Schiller's strong and weak points. As a catalogue it leaves little to be desired, but its value for the student would have been trebled, had the list of names been supplemented by something more in the way of a critical estimate of the importance and relation to each other of the different writers; we should also have welcomed, what Prof.

Schiller is undoubtedly competent to give, some account of the mass of evidence from inscriptions, coins and monuments which recent research has accumulated, and of its general bearing on the literary tradition.

Roughly speaking, it may be said that the three points on which the attention of the historian should be fastened during this period are, first, the development and working of the elaborate administrative machinery, by means of which Diocletian and his successors hoped to compensate for the decay of internal strength and spontaneous energy; secondly, the growth of the Christian Church and its relations with the imperial government on the one hand, and the barbarians on the other; thirdly, the movements of the barbarian peoples themselves. To the first of these Prof. Schiller devotes about a hundred pages, closely packed with solid matter, and it is here perhaps that his want of constructive skill will be most keenly felt. Emperor and senate, the civil and financial administration, the court and the army are all separately dealt with, their functions and position stated, but though we are shown in turn each part of the machinery, we get no clear impression of its actual working and effects. Thus the section on the civil administration (pp. 44–68) would have been all the better for the omission of some of the less important details as to the duties of the various officials, and the insertion of a few of those graphic illustrations from the actual history which are necessary to give life and meaning to the most careful analysis. Apart from this excessively anatomical treatment and an occasional want of sequence in the arrangement (e.g. the account of the mode of succession to the imperial purple, and of the system of joint rule, is interposed between the paragraphs dealing with the names borne by the emperors and those dealing with their titles), there is little in this part of the book to call for special criticism in a brief review like the present. A few points however may be noticed. Prof. Schiller leaves us in some doubt as to his view of the 'nomina' borne by Diocletian and Maximian. We do not quite understand whether he thinks that Diocletian assumed both Aurelius and Valerius on his accession, or whether he considers that 'Valerius,' as is just possible, previously belonged to him. As regards Maximian, he was surely 'ein

Aureliar' only because, as Prof. Schiller elsewhere implies, he assumed or was granted the two names 'Aurelius Valerius' on being associated with Diocletian in the government. The Oriental pomp with which the emperors of this period surrounded themselves is rightly traced further back than Diocletian, but the statement that its introduction was due to the 'Verlegung des Schwerpunktes des Römerreichs nach Osten' (pp. 33, 34) is hardly adequate as an explanation. Prof. Schiller comes nearer to one at least of the reasons for this, when on p. 122, note 1, he calls attention to the direct imitation of Sassanid practice by Diocletian. In other words this orientalising tendency, for which strange to say two such vigorous and soldierlike emperors as Aurelian and Diocletian are mainly responsible, was the result partly of a desire to surround the Roman emperor with as much visible majesty as his only rivals in the East, the Sassanid kings; partly of a hope that, if thus fenced round by ceremonial and dignified by outward splendour, he might be rendered less accessible to attack from his own subjects. It was, in fact, like the practice of adoption, one of several methods intended to remedy the two weakest points in the imperial system, the want of a legitimate origin, and of an established order of succession. The section on the civil administration, though cast in too statistical a form, is accurate and fairly complete. The author correctly points out that this later administrative system is distinguished from the earlier by its exact division of labour, and the substitution for the old type of magistrates with their ill-defined prerogatives and conflicting jurisdiction of the 'Berufsbeamte' und 'Berufsoffizier' (p. 44). He does not, however, call attention to the fact that this newer type of official is from the first characteristic of the imperial service, as distinct from that of the state, and that its gradual spread marks the progressive extension of that service over the whole area of the empire to the exclusion of the other. In the section on finance, we cannot help regretting that Prof. Schiller has not given a fuller and clearer account of the imperial census itself. The subject is no doubt full of difficulties, but considering its importance the space allotted to it is certainly small. We should also have welcomed a more detailed discussion of the origin and position of the 'coloni,' the class of free labourers bound to the soil, who fill so large a place in the legislation of the period, and on whom a vast amount of

ingenious speculation has been expended. We may note in passing that the conjecture (p. 78) as to the wide extent of the 'agri fiscales' in Italy is to some extent confirmed by the evidence of Cassiodorius. There is lastly a little inconvenience in the arrangement by which the account of the actual working and results of the system are relegated to a chapter at the end of the volume. Thus the part played by guilds such as that of the 'navicularii,' and the influence of financial necessities on the development of the colonate, are treated of apart from the general tendency to stereotype the machinery of society, which is so marked a characteristic of the Later Empire, but for an account of which the reader must turn to p. 444. Numismatic questions have evidently a special attraction for Prof. Schiller, and not the least valuable parts of his book are his account of Diocletian's reform of the coinage (pp. 147 *sqq.*), and such discussions of the evidence derived from coins, as that in the chapter (pp. 204 *sqq.*) on the attitude of Constantine towards the Christian Church. On the other hand, Prof. Schiller leaves the problem of the real meaning of Diocletian's famous edict 'de pretiis rerum venalium' very much where it was.

The relations between the Church and the Empire the author has treated with as much care and completeness as his limited space allowed. The chief interest of his work here lies in his endeavour to trace the gradual change in the imperial policy from one of friendly neutrality to one of declared partisanship, a change which elevated the Church to a position which was incompatible with the 'staatliche Omnipotenz' of the emperor (p. 415), 'damit war ein höhere Gewalt über dem absoluten Kaiser anerkannt' (p. 436). Thus while fully allowing the influence of the Church in saving Roman civilisation and even the Roman state from extinction, he places it side by side with the inroads of the barbarians as one of the forces hostile to the imperial system in the fourth century.

The barbarian advance is not so satisfactorily handled. In the fifth and last chapter Prof. Schiller indeed notices briefly the barbarising, as it is called, of the empire, by the wholesale settlements of barbarian captives in the provinces, the increasing use of them in the imperial army, and the frequent elevation of barbarians to high posts in the imperial service. He lays stress also on the fact that to the lower classes within the empire the barbarians not seldom

brought relief from intolerable burdens (p. 440). But we miss any chapters such as those on the ecclesiastical policy of Constantine, or of Gratian and Theodosius, dealing with the question as a whole, and

even so critical a moment as that of the admission of the Goths by Valens is treated in far too incidental a fashion.

H. F. PELHAM.

STUDIA BIBLICA.

(Continued from p. 197.)

THE essay of Bishop Wordsworth above referred to is 'On the Corbey MS. of St. James,' an old Latin MS. (ff.) now in St. Petersburg; and Prof. Sanday has supplied 'Further Remarks' on the same MS. The hypothesis of Bishop Wordsworth is that the original language was Aramaic, and that the Corbey version is not derived from our present Greek text but from a different translation. Amongst the passages which he thinks this hypothesis helps to explain are: ii. 7, 'blasphemant in bono nomine,' v. 2, 'res [for vestes] vestrae tiniaverunt' where the confusion of 'res' and 'vestes,' impossible in Greek, might occur from the double sense of the Aramaic *māu*. However, he also quotes Dr. Hort's suggestion that *ues-* has been lost before *res vestrae*. In confirmation of his hypothesis of an Aramaic original, he shows by an analysis of the vocabulary that the writer 'must have had a rather wide range of classical reading.' It seems to us that the rare words found in the Epistle do not suffice to prove this. They may have been familiar colloquially and locally. The word *περπερεύεσθαι* in 1 Cor. xiii. 4 is found, we believe, only once in any other Greek writer, and that much later than St. Paul. But the compound *ἐμπερπερεύεσθαι* is used by Cicero (*ad Att.* i. 14) in a way which makes it probable that it was a familiar word. And such words as *ἀνερμίζω*, *δαιμονιώδης*, *χρυσοδακτύλιος*, may well have been colloquially used; *ἀνερμίζω* is given by Hesychius as an explanation of another word (*ἀναψύξαι*): *χρυσοδακτύλιος* is also used by him in explanation of another word. Both it and *δαιμονιώδης* occur in Greek Scholiasts. Such facts are indications of popular use.

Prof. Sanday in his essay on the same Corbey MS. compares it minutely with the Vulgate, Jerome's quotations and the so-called *Speculum* of St. Augustine, and concludes (differing herein from the Bishop), that the Corbey MS. and the Vulgate do not proceed from fundamentally different stocks, whereas the text of the *Speculum* does pro-

ceed from a different source. He thinks that the Vulgate text in this Epistle owes extremely little to Jerome, and that the peculiarities in the Corbey text are due to a definite local recension. Some words of Lagarde go to the root of the question, Whence arose the marked differences? Replying to Hartel (who said that the scribe of the Verona MS. seemed like a grammarian teaching boys how to vary their expressions, preferring for no probable reason *pacificis* to *pacatis*; *nefaria* to *nefanda*, etc.) Lagarde observes that 'the probable cause was that in the learned or popular speech of the district for which the MS. was intended the one word was not in use, and therefore had to be replaced by another.'

With reference to the old Latin texts generally, Prof. Sanday concludes from his examination of the first two Gospels that there were two parent stocks and not more, the African and European. The Vulgate of St. James is mainly European, but with a peculiar element, not necessarily African. However, in *Old Latin Texts*, p. cclv, he withdraws this expression of opinion as to the fundamental separation between the two families of texts, thinking that the time for a definite conclusion had not yet come.

Mr. Gwilliam examines a Syriac Biblical MS. of the fifth century (*Brit. Mus. Add.* 14459, fol. 1—66), containing the first two Gospels. The text does not differ in any essential particular from that of Widmanstadt, and such differences as exist affect but very slightly the relation of the Syriac version to the original Greek text. We give a few instances:—

Matt. xvii. 21 not omitted (om. S* B.)

xix. 17 agrees with Text. Rec.

xxiv. 36 has not οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός.

xxvii. 35 = Rec.

Mk. vi. 11; ix. 44, 46. xv. 28 = Rec.

The last verses of St. Mark are given without any note of doubtfulness. In Matt. xxviii. 18 it adds (with the printed Peshito), 'and as my Father sent me I send you.'

On Matt. viii. 15 Mr. Gwilliam (p. 160) quotes this MS. as agreeing with Widmanstadt and the Curetonian in reading *αὐτοῖς*, whereas on p. 171 he quotes it as reading *αὐτῶ*.

The text does not approximate to the Curetonian. On the whole Mr. Gwilliam derives from his study of Syriac MSS. a strong conviction in favour of the type of Greek text represented by the later MSS.

Prof. Sanday, on the other hand, from the phenomena of the *Codex Rossanensis* (Σ) draws an inference of an opposite kind. That *Codex* containing the first two Gospels is believed to date from the sixth century. It supports generally the common text, and is in some places the oldest uncial authority that does so. Nevertheless it is found to contain eighty-six manifestly wrong readings which have little or no support besides. 'And yet there is no difference in kind between these readings and those which form so large a part of the characteristic text of the great mass of MSS.' Its agreement with

these in other cases therefore tends rather to confirm the suspicion of wholesale correction and emendation to which they are exposed.

This MS. is so closely related to that known as N (also a *Codex Purpureus*) which contains fragments of the same Gospels, that Von Gebhardt thinks they may even have been copied directly from the same exemplar.

Space will not allow us to do more than mention the titles of the remaining essays: Prof. Driver 'On Recent Theories on the Origin and Nature of the Tetragrammaton'; Mr. Woods 'On the Septuagint Version of the Books of Samuel'; Mr. Edersheim 'On Wetzel's Theory of the Synoptic Gospels'; Prof. Sanday 'On the Commentary attributed to Theophilus of Antioch'; Mr. Randell 'On the date of S. Polycarp's Martyrdom' (which with Jahn, Lightfoot, etc. he fixes in 155 A.D.); and Mr. Neubauer 'On some Temanite and Nabataean Inscriptions dating from between 3 B.C. and 79 A.D.'

T. K. ABBOTT.

The Truth about Homer. With some remarks on Professor Jebb's 'Introduction to Homer.' By F. A. PALEY, M.A., LL.D. London, F. Norgate, and the 'Cambridge Chronicle' Office. 1887. 24 pp. 1s.

WE all know Mr. Paley's views on Homer. The real Homeric poems were the poems on the later events of the siege and the returns of the heroes, which we commonly call 'cyclic'; the Iliad and the Odyssey are manufactured epics only just older than Plato. In this pamphlet, Mr. Paley goes over the old ground, with no new arguments, but only a long moan over the sad perversity of Mr. Jebb in disregarding the old ones. Of course, there is no reviling or railing, no bitterness or insinuation, in Mr. Paley's language; in one sentence he gets as far as '*suppressio veri*,' but he retracts it in the next. He is not indignant, he is only sad. He knows the truth; the world and Mr. Jebb will neither believe nor listen.

We may say at once that Mr. Paley does disprove the theory which he attacks, the theory that the Iliad and the Odyssey, just as they are, with every word and every line just as we have them, were finished before 800 B.C. But then that is a theory that nobody believes, not even Dr. Hayman. Everybody believes that the poems, as we have them, have undergone some amount of change since their origin; the question is, how much change, and what kind of change. Mr. Paley only refutes antagonists who hold that there has been no change at all. And, very strangely, Mr. Paley's theory is far more hostile to the irresistible internal evidences of growth in the poems as we have them, than the theories of his most old-fashioned opponents. He thinks, as they do, that the poems were written all at once; but while they leave plenty of time for interpolations and modernizations, he leaves no time at all; all the discrepancies of story, all the double redactions, all the differing usages of language, must have been put in by

the same author, with his eyes open, and then have spread over the world at once, stereotyped in the form which they have retained for 2200 years. Of course, Mr. Paley puts these down to the variations in the poet's sources; and that might stand when he used to regard the poet as a mere compiler, (though even then what a stupid compiler he must have been!); but in this pamphlet the theory of compilation is practically given up. Mr. Paley still talks about 'editing' and 'redaction,' and 'these poems in their new and highly elaborated form'; but when he says (p. 4) that 'Plato used a literary written epitome or "redaction" of the two poems, constructed each round a central figure, a dramatic *Protagonistes*, in an age of rhetoric, high culture, sophistic teachings of the rights and duties of humanity'; when he explains that Penelope's suitors are an imitation of Helen's suitors, and Odysseus's beggary at Ithaca is a reproduction of his beggary in the Trojan camp, that the characters of Helen and Menelaus are not degraded by Sophocles and Euripides, but elevated by the new poet from the savage level of the old epics,¹—when Mr. Paley does all this, he is describing, not a redactor at all, but an independent poet, with an independent poet's responsibility for unity of treatment.

¹ This is the strangest of Mr. Paley's sayings, and deserves full quotation. Pp. 12, 13, 'It was thus, that in an age when women had begun to take their just part in social life, a Helen and a Penelope were invested with new attributes, and Helen ceased to be the "she-devil," the Erinyes of the tragedies, and became a kindly and hospitable matron. In the same way the Odysseus and the Menelaus of our Homer are by no means the treacherous villains that they are uniformly made to appear in tragedy. It is a perverse view that the bad character shews "decadence" from the good, as represented by Homer. Why should the poets of the most cultured age in Attica have systematically preferred the bad? Rather, we have to contemplate the evolution from savagery to Socratic teaching. No man of sense now holds that early man was good and moral, just and chaste, and that later man became depraved.' (The italics are my own.) But the tragedians lived in the 'cultured age' as well. Why did they leave the brutal Menelaus and the wanton Helen unreformed?

But in truth, so far as this theory of the date is concerned, refutation is more than Mr. Paley has a right to demand. The end of the 5th century B.C. is not one of the dark ages; if in the time of Aristophanes there appeared an epic poet of 27,000 lines, totally at variance with the traditions of his predecessors, and yet received at once into triumphant popularity all over the Greek world, he must have left some trace of his existence in our extant literature. If he could exist and be buried in silence, there is no reason why we should not believe that Greece was full of greater generals than Brasidas and greater poets than Sophocles and greater cities than Athens. History is at an end, and we had better burn our books.

Because Mr. Paley's theory is untenable, we may not therefore dismiss all his incidental observations. It is perfectly true that there are great difficulties connected with the sources of tragic story; (but what possesses Mr. Paley to include Mr. Jebb among people who do not 'possess any special acquaintance with the themes of the Tragic' ?); with the history of writing; with the structure of the Homeric language. To persevere in insisting on the difficulties is itself a good work; but there, I am afraid, Mr. Paley's services to Homer end. It is sad to say it of such an indomitable scholar, who has laboured so long in so many fields; but, so far as the Homeric language is concerned, he does not know the conditions of the problem. 'Such evident sacrifice of grammar to metrical convenience as *πληθὺν δ' οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ' ὀνομήνω*,' 'the rare words *τείρεα* 'stars' and *τέλσον* came from Sanscrit,' 'the frequent use of *ἐδς* as *tuus*. . . these spurious modernisms also in the *Iliad* (*ἐοῖο* being thinly disguised under a reading *ἔηος*).' 'The man who can say these things is scarcely one from whom we can hope to learn 'the truth about Homer.'—T. C. SNOW.

Orphica, recens. EUGENIUS ABEL, in Schenkl's *Bibliotheca*, Pragae et Lipsiae, 8vo. 1885, pp. 320. 5 Mk.

THE editor of this work is already favourably known by his labours in the same field, having brought out in 1881 a careful edition of the *Lithica*. It is a field in which very little has been done by English scholars since the days of Tyrwhitt and Dr. Askew. The reason of this must be sought, we suppose, in the comparatively slight importance attached to the subject; since the condition of the Orphic texts has long been such as to offer the fullest scope for critical emendation. As Abel speaks in his preface of an 'editio major,' for which he is reserving his commentary, the present work must be taken as an instalment only. Its merits consist in a more thorough revision of the text; a better arrangement of the Fragments, by which they are grouped as far as possible under the headings of works known to have once existed; and in a considerable addition to the number of such *disjecta membra* hitherto collected. The last piece in this edition, the *Hymnus in Isim*, was only recovered about forty years ago from a marble slab in the island of Andros. It is unfortunately in a mutilated condition.

It is to the state of the text, as here represented, that the student will turn with most curiosity. The amount of Orphic lines, when some are recovered from writers as late as Marsiglio Ficino, will be a matter of less interest to him than their restoration to their primitive form. And certainly, when we consider that the manuscripts to be worked with are mostly of the 15th, or even 16th century, the task of such restoration will be seen to be a difficult one. Great latitude must, in such a case, be left to conjecture; the misfortune being that readings so obtained

fail to carry the sort of conviction we experience, when a slight verbal change in the text of a good manuscript makes the sense clear. A very few instances, to which our space limits us, will enable the reader to judge in some measure for himself, and will also serve to indicate how much has already been done for the text. In *Argon.* 178 (the numbering is from Hermann's edition), the reading, as it stood in Eschenbach's edition of 1689, was

ἐν φθιτοῖσιν ἔτευξ', ἀσκληπιοῖο εἵνεκα λάβης.

Hermann adopted Pierson's emendation of ἐν φθιμένοισιν, but altered ἔτευξε to ἔταξε, on the ground that the former word would not be used in such a connection. 'Ἀσκληπιοῦ, of course, was an obvious change. Abel, we think rightly, edits

ἐν φθιμένοισιν ἔτευξ', Ἀσκληπιοῦ, κ.τ.λ.

Such phrases as ἄγνωστον τεύχειν (*Od.* xiii. 191) seem to justify this usage of ἔτευξε. In *Argon.* 1068 the old reading of Esch. was

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κ' ἐν τοῖσι δύνῃ ἀμέγαρτον ἔθηκαν
ἀθάνατοι, κ.τ.λ.

Voss altered the κ' ἐν to μέν, which did not mend matters greatly. Hermann produced αὐτὰρ οἱ Μινύησι δύνῃ, κ.τ.λ., which, with its lengthening of αὐτὰρ, could satisfy no one. Abel accepts the ingenious conjecture of Wiel, ἐπειγομένοισι. Dr. Wiel, in his *Observationes* (1853), had started a number of emendations of the *Argonautica*, many acute, others over bold. Now and then Abel improves upon these, as in *Argon.* 1114-5, where (speaking of the Macrobian) the old text had

μειλιχίῃ δέ τοι αἰὲν ἐπ' ὀφρύσι νεῦσε γαλήνη
παῖδεσιν ἡδὲ τοκεῦσιν ἐπὶ φρεσὶν, ἡδὲ νόοιο,
αἰσιμὰ τε βέξειν, κ.τ.λ.

Hermann altered the latter part of the second line to ἐπεὶ φρεσὶν οἶδαν ἐοῖσιν. Wiel, objecting to οἶδαν, suggested ἐψφροσύνη δὲ νόοιο. Abel, with ἐπιφροσύνη, seems to us to be nearer the mark.

In *Frag.* xlvii. (Herm.), where the old reading was

Πρώτιστος μὲν ἀναξ ἐκ ἐπιχθονίων Κρόνος ἀνδρῶν,
and where Hermann could propose nothing better than ἀπ' for ἐκ, Abel happily restores

πρώτιστος μὲν ἀνασσειν, κ.τ.λ.

In *Hymn.* lxiv. (on Νόμος), v. 6

καὶ φθόνον οὐ δίκαιον ροῖζου τρόπον αὐτὸς ἐλαύνει,
while οὐ δίκαιον seems certainly corrupt, neither Hermann's οὐ νόμιμον nor Wiel's οὐ τιδανόν, accepted by Abel, will probably carry conviction. More satisfactory is καὶ μίμνειν ἀμίαντον, *Lith.* 362, for the old καὶ σεμνὸν ἀδαντον. One of the most difficult to decide upon is the proper name at the beginning of *Argon.* 751, where the course of the Argo near the Tauric Chersonese is being described. As they stood in Eschenbach's text, the lines were

οὐ σύμης ὕρος ἐστὶ, πολὺς τ' εὐθαλῆς λειμών
ἐνθα δ' ἀράξου ρεῦμα μεγαβρεμέτου ποταμοῖο.

'Symen nemo novit,' wrote Hermann, and gave the improved reading

οὐ Σίνδης ὕρος αἰπύ, καὶ εὐθαλέες λειμῶνες
ἐνθα δ' Ἀράξω ρεῦμα, κ.τ.λ.

This Abel retains. But the instance may serve to show on how conjectural a basis the text yet rests. The Sindi are no doubt mentioned by Strabo as in the Macotic region referred to; but there is no striking resemblance between Σύμης and Σίνδης. Old Dr. Vincent, of Westminster, in his annotated copy of Gesner's *Orpheus*, conjectured Σοάνης (the Soanians being mentioned in the same chapter of Strabo, Lib. xi. c. ii.). It is just possible that

Δύμης may prove the true reading. In cursive MSS. the confusion between σ and δ (σῶμα for δῶμα, etc.) is common. Δύμη is well known as the name of the Achaean town, near the western promontory Araxus. And the Ἀχαιοί, supposed descendants of the Thesprotian Achaeans who came in the Argo, are specified by Strabo as settled with other tribes near the Caucasus. He mentions them in the same list as the Sindians. There is no proof that they had named one of their towns after the Dyme in the Peloponnese. But the thing is not impossible, and it is a little noticeable that the old reading Ἀράξου, just after, would give the name of the rocky promontory near the Achaean Dyme.

The reader will infer, from what has been said, that the editor's task has been well and carefully discharged. It may be added that the printing is very good. *Emendatio* (Praef. p. 1) should be *Emendationes*; and the year 1844 (p. 295, n. 1.) appears to be incorrectly given. We shall look with interest for the appearance of Abel's larger edition of the *Orphica*.—J. H. L.

Demosthenis Orationes selectae. In usum scholarum edidit C. WOTKE. Leipzig, Freytag. Prague, Tempsky. 1887, pp. 77; 60 Pf.

FOR the sum of less than eightpence we have here a text of eight of the public speeches of Demosthenes, printed in the following order:—the first Philippic, the three Olynthiacs, the *De Pace*, the second Philippic, the *De Chersoneso* and the third Philippic. We have also a very brief Latin argument to each, as well as a short life of the orator, a woodcut of his statue in the Vatican, a map in illustration of the history of the time, an index of proper names, and one or two pages of critical appendix. The text is mainly that of the eighth edition of Westermann's select orations, as revised by Rosenberg in 1883, with a few alterations due to the fourth edition of the Teubner text of the first nineteen speeches, as revised by Blass in 1885.

The life, which extends over three pages without a break, and without even a capital letter to mark the beginning of each sentence, would obviously be improved by being broken into paragraphs. The woodcut of the Vatican statue is fairly satisfactory.

The map unfortunately does not extend further south than Argos, and accordingly excludes several places and districts to which Demosthenes refers, such as Laconia and Messenia, Megalopolis, Cos and Rhodes. Thespieae, though mentioned twice (*de Pace* 10 and *Phil.* ii 30), is neither marked on the map nor recorded in the index. In the latter, the Erythraeans, named in *Chers.* 24, are described as *incolae urbis Erythrarum in Bocotia prope Platacas sitae*; whereas it is clear from the context and, in particular, from the mention of Chios and Asia, that the orator refers to Erythrae on the coast of Asia, opposite Chios, and not to Erythrae in Boeotia. In the same index Thasos, which is vaguely defined as an *insula maris Aegaei*, has surely quite as much right as Lemnos to be called an *insula maris Thracii*. To the description of Καβύλη as an *urbs Thraciae*, should be added *situs incerti*; and to that of Μάστερα, *aliunde ignota*. The 'Carian' whom, at the date of the delivery of the *De Pace*, B.C. 346, the Athenians 'are allowing to hold possession of Chios, Cos and Rhodes' (§ 25, ἐῶμεν καταλαμβάνειν), is not the *rex Cariae Mausolus*, as stated in the index; for Mausolus, who originally took possession of those islands, had died several years before the speech was delivered; and the prince of Caria, at the time, was his brother Idrieus.

The readings adopted by the editor, who makes no suggestions of his own, do not appear to call for any

special remark. But in a book meant for school-boys, *quibus tradere non liceat nisi certissima*, as the editor himself remarks in his preface, it might have been better to desert the manuscript reading, when it involves the collocation of *ἄν* with the future participle, as in *Phil.* iii 70 (= 68 of this ed.) πάλαι τις ἡδέως *ἄν* ἴσως ἐρωτήσων κάθηται, and to accept ἐρωτήσας, which is proposed by Cobet and admitted into the text by critics of such learning and judgment as Weil and Blass. The critical appendix, which gives a conspectus of the forty instances in which the text of one or other of those critics is preferred to that of Rosenberg, includes no explanation, however brief, of the symbols used to designate the MSS quoted. It adopts the same abbreviation (Herm.) for the Greek rhetorician, Hermogenes; and for the German periodical, *Hermes*. Thus, in the references borrowed from Blass, Herm. iv 753 means the scholia on the former; and Choric. Herm. xvii 216, 9, the declamation of another rhetorician, Choricus, first printed in the latter. It ascribes ὥσπερ ὑμῖν συμφέρον in *Phil.* i 51 to "A. Schaefer Blass," instead of the MS *χ*, followed by G. H. Schaefer and Blass. Under *Ol.* ii 14 καὶ τοι is a mistake for καὶ (ante ὑποί); and on § 28, εἰσφέρετε is twice printed for εἰσεφέρετε. On *Chers.* 61, as well as in the text, προσήκεν is a mistake for προσήκει. This appendix is for the most part unintelligible except to those who have access to other editions of the text. What is the use of saying vaguely ἀπλῶς *omisi*, or *delevi* τὴν μεταβολήν, or *seclusi* Ἀμφίπολιν, without giving any clue as to the exact position in which those words are found in other editions? When the words themselves have vanished from the text, a mere reference to the section where they once stood is quite insufficient.

A careful perusal of the whole of the text has led to the detection of the following misprints: *Ol.* i 7 ὥς...δεῖν (for δεῖ), *Ol.* ii 10 Ἀθηναῖνοι, *Ol.* iii 23 ἂ τις, *Chers.* 14 μεταμπέμπεται, 61 προσήκεν (for προσήκει), *Phil.* iii 26 οὐδ' twice for οὐθ', 60 οἱ δέ (for οἱ δέ), and in the index Φεραῖ for Φεραί. The punctuation, again, is often defective, although this is a point of special importance in a plain text intended for use in schools. Thus in *Ol.* i 11, καὶ περὶ τῶν πραγμάτων οὕτως οἱ μὴ χρησάμενοι τοῖς καιροῖς ὀρθῶς οὐδ' εἰ συνέβη τι παρὰ τῶν θεῶν χρηστὸν, μνημονεύουσιν, we should either omit the comma after χρηστὸν, or add a comma after ὀρθῶς. In *Chers.* 2, οὐς κατὰ τοὺς νόμους ἐφ' ὑμῖν ἔστιν, ὅταν βούλησθε κολάζειν, we expect a comma after βούλησθε. In *Phil.* iii 37, ζῆλος, εἴ τις εἰληφέ τι γέλως, ἄν ὁμολογῇ, μῖσος, ἄν τούτοις τις ἐπιτιμᾷ, we clearly require a colon after ὁμολογῇ. Similar instances occur in *Ol.* ii 5; *Ol.* iii 17, 18, 33; *de Pace* 7; *Phil.* ii 3, 4, 13; and *Chers.* 12, 26, 67. In the index, it would have been better to distinguish the titles of several speeches by the symbols or abbreviations in ordinary use, instead of introducing a new notation by which VII stands for the *de Chersoneso*, and VIII for the *Third Philippic*, whereas these speeches, when denoted by Roman numerals, are elsewhere always numbered Or. VIII and IX respectively. In the speech last named, the numbering of all the sections from 8 to 74 is needlessly and injudiciously thrown out of agreement with that of other texts, by the omission of two sections which are not found in the two best manuscripts. Lastly the binding is far too flimsy for a school-book; the copy under review, though carefully handled, is already falling into pieces, and the connexion between the three Olynthiacs and the following speeches is at this moment hanging entirely on a single thread.

If, with the help of these and other suggestions, the editor will redeem his promise of doing his best to

improve the book, it may in time become sufficiently accurate to be worth binding and interleaving as a convenient text-book; but, for the present, our schools will do well to remain true to the Teubner text, especially as the volume containing these speeches has been recently revised with the minutest care by a critic of no less ability than Professor Blass.

J. E. SANDYS.

Plutarchi De Proverbiis Alexandrinorum. Libellus Ineditus. Recensuit et praefatus est OTTO CRUSIUS. Leipzig, Teubner. 1887. Mk. 2.80.

THE editor, in his introduction to this little collection of proverbs, maintains stoutly its Plutarchic origin. But the evidence is, from the nature of the case, far from convincing. The collection is, in none of the MSS., unambiguously assigned to Plutarch; and this absence of direct testimony is scarcely atoned for by such considerations as the interest in proverbial lore and the love of historical illustration revealed in Plutarch's acknowledged writings and supposed to be reflected in this assumed work of his, or by the fact that the historical characters referred to in this collection, together with the authorities such as Apio and Seleucus whom the collector must have followed, reach without exceeding the limits of Plutarch's life. Indeed if we regard internal evidence alone, it is not easy to trace in the comments on these proverbs the facile touch and kindly wisdom of the Sage of Chaeronea, though the proverbs themselves may partly account for this, as they are of the erudite order and contain as little mother-wit as their origin would lead us to expect. But viewed in the light rather of paroemiography than of literature, the collection has its interest; and after having been known in manuscript since the time of Erasmus, it has now been for the first time edited and provided with a full critical apparatus. The editor has further described the fortunes of the work of Zenobius with which those of this collection have been closely—indeed almost inextricably—associated. It is perhaps unnecessary to explain that the latter, whoever its author may be, is to be distinguished from the 'liber spurius' of Wyttenbach's *Moralia* and Leutsch and Schneidewin's *Paroemiographi Graeci*. Its title is not Πλουτάρχου παροιμιαί ἀπὸ 'Αλεξανδρείας ἐχρῶντο but (Πλουτάρχου) περὶ τῶν παρ' Ἀλεξανδρεῦσι παροιμιῶν. It has no separate existence in the work of the Göttingen editors, but almost all the proverbs it contains may be found in one or other of the collections they give. (The only exceptions I have noted are δανάκη, συντομώτερος ληκύθου, ὁ Φθᾶς σοι λελάληκεν, γράφαις πρὸς τὴν Ἄρτεμιν.) It is this 'contamination' which presents the great difficulty; and though he has made the most of the help of three MSS. in which the proverbs in question stand by themselves, Crusius is himself compelled to admit that the work he gives is but a fragment and one containing many uncertainties both of ascription and of reading.—W. RHYNS ROBERTS.

Eudoxi ars astronomica qualis in charta Aegyptiaca superest. Denuo edita a FREDERICO BLASS. Kiliae MDCCCLXXXVII. 1 Mk.

THIS tract, which cannot be called interesting to the mathematician or the historian of mathematics, appears to be principally valuable as a confused work affording amplex to an ingenious editor for emendation and reconciliation with notions of Eudoxus elsewhere acquired.

Eudoxus lived from B.C. 408 to B.C. 355, and was noted as an astronomer as well as geometer, physician, and legislator. His work on practical astronomy,

the *Φαινόμενα*, is the foundation of Aratus's extant poem. The tract now in question is credibly argued to bear date between 193 and 165 B.C. It was found on a papyrus in the Egyptian Museum at Paris, and first edited by Brunet de Presle in 1865. The handwriting is not that of a professional copyist, and the spelling is bad; hence it is supposed that we have here, not a copy of a treatise written by Eudoxus himself, but the work of an unskilled pupil of an Eudoxean school. Part of it is written in iambs, and it is prefaced by twelve iambs in acrostic form, the initial letters making up ΕΥΔΟΞΟΥΤΕΧΝΗ.

The editor makes it his business to determine what in the treatise is Eudoxus' own, and what the superstructure of his pupil's ignorance. The names of the planets and certain other descriptions are held to be genuine, while anything which appears to the editor unworthy of Eudoxus is attributed to the pupil. For an account of the dogmas attributed to Eudoxus we must refer to the dissertation itself: we will give only one illustration of the editor's procedure. The tract asserts that the sun never suffers total eclipse, while the moon does; at this statement, says Blass, there is perhaps no cause for astonishment, because of the rare occurrence of those total eclipses of the sun which are visible from one spot on the earth's surface. But the further statement that the moon is larger than the earth he scouts as unworthy of Eudoxus as a mathematician, seeing that it is the intervention of the earth which totally eclipses the moon. The tract further asserts that the ratio, in magnitude, of the earth to the moon is that of a musical fourth to a fifth, i.e., Earth : Moon = $\frac{3}{4} : \frac{3}{5} = 9 : 8$. Blass cannot bring himself to believe that a mathematician of Eudoxus' calibre could suppose both the sun and moon to be larger than the earth. Assuming, then, this negative, and, further, that Eudoxus did not suppose the moon alone to be larger than the earth, Blass's conclusion that Eudoxus held the descending order of magnitude to be earth, sun, moon, is at least as probable as the other possible alternative! Blass accordingly alters the text so as to change the order, sun, moon, earth, into the order, earth, sun, moon. And now, says he, the ratio 9 : 8 above mentioned is clearly not the ratio of the earth to the moon, as it is said to be, but the ratio of the earth to the sun; and once more the text is altered accordingly.—T. L. HEATH.

Scholia in Euripidem. Ed. E. SCHWARTZ. Vol. I. Scholia in Hecubam Orestem Phoenissas. (Reimer: Berlin. Price, 9 Mark.)

THIS edition of the Euripidean scholia differs essentially from the edition of Dindorf. While Dindorf published all the scholia he could find, including the late Byzantine with their utterly worthless repetitions, Herr Schwartz prints only the scholia vetera, confining himself to the four best MSS., namely the well-known Marcian of the twelfth century (M), Vatican 909 of the thirteenth (A), Parisinus 2713 of the thirteenth (B), and a Turin MS. (for the Orestes and Phoenissae) (T). He considers that these four MSS. contain the data for arriving at the most ancient recension of the old scholia on the Hecuba, Orestes and Phoenissae; and to arrive at such an original recension seems to be the chief interest in studying Euripidean scholia. It is only rarely that they throw much light on the text or interpretation of the author, and they usually need but little illustration themselves. Thus they have neither the charm of obscurity like the Medicean scholia on Aeschylus, nor the merit of elucidation like the scholia on Aristophanes. Nevertheless they have sometimes been helpful. A scholion suggested to

Valekenauer a generally received correction in a line of the Hippolytus, and some clever emendations of Weil can be supported by hints in the scholia. A scholion on Orestes l. 327, it may be remarked, enables us to refute an attempt recently made to discredit *φοῖτος* as a non-existent word. (See Verrall, Sept. c. Theb., l. 661.) This scholion, *λύσσα καὶ μανία καὶ φοῖτος ἐν ἑστίν*, shews that *φοῖτος* was at least in use. On l. 147 of the same play (*ἰδ' ἀτρεμαῖον ὡς ὑπόροφον*) there is a note of more than usual interest, and Weil's rejection of the interpretation will perhaps be hardly considered final. *ὑπόροφον* is connected with *ῥοφος* a reed of downy nature (*λαχνήεντ' ῥοφον*, Il. Ω 451), of which the tongues of flutes were made, and the passage is taken to mean, 'gently like a reed softly stirred' or 'a reed whispering in the wind.' MTAB contain this explanation in the same words; two of them M and B have an intermarginal note to a different effect (*τὴν μὴ διακινουμένην ἔξω τοῦ ὀρόφου ὃ ἐστὶ βραχέϊαν*).

Herr Schwartz has pointed out many glosses and notes which were omitted by Dindorf, and has presented us with a much more accurate text, as was to be expected. He has not neglected to avail himself of the help of the inferior MSS.—for they are occasionally useful—; as for example, Orestes 15, where MTAB have *ἐρωτῶν*, Vat. 1345 has preserved *ἐρωτῶντι*. His edition will certainly supersede Dindorf's.

It is to be regretted that some steps are not taken to discover and collate that seventh century uncial palimpsest of Euripides which H. O. Coxe saw in the Levant and from which C. Tischendorf made a few extracts at Jerusalem. Coxe mentions it in his 'Report to Her Majesty's government on the Greek Manuscripts yet remaining in libraries of the Levant, London 1858,' but it is now quite unknown what has become of it. It would be perhaps of little value to Herr Schwartz for the scholia (cf. Preface, p. vii), but it would be of the greatest value for the text.

JOHN B. BURY.

Quaestiones Diodorcae Mythographicae dissertatio inauguralis philologica quam...scripsit Ericus Bethe. (Gottingae, 1887.) Mk. 2.40.

THIS is one of those elaborate *Quellenstudien*, which are so common in Germany and so rare in England. Herr Bethe's work exhibits all the learning and minuteness that might be expected from a pupil of Hermann Sauppe and Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, and for the student of mythology it will possess considerable interest on account of the great mythographical importance of the early books of Diodōros. One of the most important sources of Diodōros was always considered to be Dionysios Skytobrachion of Mytilênê, a writer of whom much has been written and little is known. The first chapter of Herr Bethe's treatise is devoted to this dim figure, and a conclusion of some interest is cleverly arrived at—that Dionysios did not write books for the learned, but *wrote romances for the general public*. In other words he did not reproduce mythological traditions from elder writers but adorned the existing and invented new legends, which the uncritical Diodōros 'swallowed,' writing of him *Διονυσίῳ τῷ συνταξαμένῳ τὰς παλαιὰς μυθοποιίας*. This conclusion is chiefly based on the fact that the tales about Bakchos which Dionysios attributes to the Libyans were evidently posterior to Alexander the Great, as they are borrowed from his adventures. The main result of the investigations is that Diodōros did not draw on Dionysios as much as has been generally supposed, for example by Heyne and Müllenhoff and E. Schwartz. His obligations to Timaios and Matris in Bk. iv. had already been pointed out by O.

Sieroka and Holzer respectively; and Bethe has carefully discussed both these sources. Of Matris we really know nothing. If Dionysios is little better than a name, Matris is little better than the shadow of a name. A great many narrations in Diodōros are shewn to have been drawn from an unknown source which was also utilized by Apollodōros in his *Bibliotheca*. The minor limit for the date of this compendium is of course 44 B.C. or thereabouts, the time at which Diodōros began to write; and Bethe ingeniously fixes a major limit at about 100 B.C. by shewing that Dionysios, who probably lived at that time, was mentioned in it.—JOHN B. BURY.

De Callistrato et Philonide sive de actionibus Aristophanis scripsit ALBERTUS BRIEL. Berolini, 1887. 8vo. Pp. 68. Mk. 1.60.

THIS is a useful and instructive pamphlet on a difficult subject. Briel advocates the view that both Callistratus and Philonides were comic poets, not actors. He holds also that in those cases in which a writer either of tragedies or comedies put his play into the hands of some one else to exhibit, the rule was for the real author's name to remain unknown, at all events until after the prizes were awarded. It follows from this that in comedies the poet had to conceal his real identity in the parabasis, and make the exhibitor speak in his own person. This, it will be seen, has a most important bearing upon the study of Aristophanes, and Briel shows much ingenuity in this part of his treatise. He has gone carefully over the ground, and sheds new light upon many places. There is also good sense in the way in which he treats the exaggerations of comedy, such as the joke about the Lacedaemonians and Aegina in *Ach.* 654, and the question of the poet's baldness.

There is one verbal conjecture made which certainly merits consideration, that of *κακίσας* for the unmetrical and unmeaning *κακίστοις* in *Vesp.* 1284.

Some few points require correction. On p. 5 he depends for an argument upon brackets in Dindorf's edition of the *Scholia*. In this case the brackets do not imply what Briel thinks. They are Dindorf's equivalent for Hermann's asterisks (see Hermann's *Nubes*, p. xiii.) Again, the passage from the *Acharnians* quoted on p. 14 does not prove Briel's point. It only shows that the spectators did not know the order in which the plays were to come at the festival.

W. GUNION RUTHERFORD.

L'Éloquence judiciaire à Rome pendant la République, par JULES POIRET. Paris: 1887. 5 fr.

M. POIRET's clear and interesting Essay may be strongly recommended to classical students, none the less because works on eloquence or the art of Rhetoric are rare, especially in England, where the name of Rhetoric is misunderstood and the study of it as an art discouraged, in spite of its great influence under our institutions. Mr. Forsyth's 'Hortensius' (on the development of judicial oratory and the bar), a book in style somewhat like M. Poiret's, is a brilliant exception, but it stands almost alone.

M. Poiret, after a brief but spirited preface on the importance of judicial eloquence among the ancients, its preponderance over other styles, and its close connection with political eloquence, followed by an interesting chapter on the topography of the Roman Forum, proceeds to place in turn on the stage so prepared all the chief figures and component parts of a Roman trial, viz.: the Presidents (or judges) and their assessors, the Judices (or jury), the position

of the accused and his advocates, that of the accuser, the course of procedure, the order of speeches, the character of the judicial sentence, &c.; and he finishes the essay with two chapters on the characteristics of eloquence most preferred at Rome and most adapted to Roman character. Under all these headings are grouped interesting notices of forms and customs ingeniously and laboriously extracted from casual allusions in Cicero's letters, speeches, or rhetorical works, or from Plutarch, Quintilian and others, *e.g.*, about the preliminaries, the open-air pleadings, and the varying place of the tribunal, the crowd surrounding it (though it is hardly fair [p. 52], to take Plautus' description of it as correct), the officers of the court, the forms of procedure, challenges of jury (p. 85), its numbers (p. 87), the limit to length of speeches, the duration of trial (as with us, till lately, rarely longer than a day) (p. 20), its adjournment (corresponding to our new trial or appeal), the indirect remuneration of counsel, forbidden to receive pay (p. 178) (a theory perpetuated at the English and French bars as well as in other modern professions). All these are interesting topics well brought out and well worth comparing with modern customs. As regards the conduct of the case M. Poiret argues (in opposition to Madvig) that the order as a rule was, first, pleadings, then witnesses, then the *altercationes*, though this order was often varied.

Chapter vi. 'On the orators,' contains some interesting passages, especially (pp. 136-9), some remarks on the rhetoricians who succeeded the orators, and, inheriting their gift of utterance, 'continued speaking when they had nothing to say,' and their treatises, which he wittily describes as 'inventories of the effects of deceased oratory,' (*des inventaires après décès*), an apology for some of Cicero's weaknesses and inconsistencies (pp. 155-173), and some amusing satirical observations on the professional disinterestedness of unpaid advocates (pp. 174-181).

The remarks on Cicero's oratorical style are indiscriminating, and the allusions to Mommsen's indiscriminating disparagement of him (pp. 135, 237, 254) no less pungent and to the point.

In Chapter x., *urbanitas* and *gravitas* are put down as the most distinctive features of Roman Eloquence, the one justly attributed to intimate relations between the magistrate, *judices*, and pleaders, similar to those that exist between our barristers and the judge, and such as did not exist at Athens; the other to the national character. On the other hand, the comparative weakness of the Roman in genuine vehemence and in the real pathetic style, as compared with the Greek, is ascribed mainly to the absence of that thrilling element of judicial oratory, the impending sentence of death (p. 278). It should be added that the *judices* at Rome were more select and educated or more luxurious and corrupt, demanded a more polished, artistic and pleasing style, and were not so likely, as the larger number of mixed Athenian jurors, to be carried away by 'the pathetic.'

The book, however, though interesting, is not always quite trustworthy, owing to some careless interpretations of certain passages or too hasty inferences from them. Some of these inferences are, to say the least, startling. What evidence is there that it was frequent or even possible in Rome for a presiding judge to play the advocate and actually leave his place on the bench to plead? (p. 71). The evidence adduced is (i.) a statement of Plutarch (*Pl. Cic.* 9, cf. Forsyth's *Cicero* I., 81), that Manilius' trial was purposely fixed by Cicero for the only remaining day of his praetorship, that he might help his cause, and a further statement that the people asked him to

act as advocate for him and that he did so act; but as Manilius' trial was eventually postponed, it was surely more likely that Cicero pleaded for him after he had ceased to be praetor than that he did so on the last day of his office and the first day of the trial at which he himself presided; (ii.) a remark of Asconius (*Pro Cornelio Fr. Argum.*) that Cicero, in the year of his praetorship, defended C. Cornelius. But Asconius goes on to say that Q. Gallius *exercuit hoc iudicium*. So there is at least no evidence that he or any one else acted as praetor and advocate in the same case. And (iii.) Cassius (p. 72) may have been famous as a judge for his strict insistence on the *cui bono* argument, but it only rests on Asconius' authority that, as *quaestor iudicii*, he pressed this argument on the *judices* (*praebat iudicibus ut quaereretur cui bono fuisset*), and even this only goes a very little way towards the conclusion suggested. That the praetor could exercise influence by his control of procedure and in the choice of court, jury, and time of trial, and, indirectly, by showing his sympathies, is true; but it is very doubtful whether Cicero means more than this in his impudent boast (*Cic. Att.* 1, 4, 2) of having gained popularity by the condemnation of Maecius, when tried before him; which reminds us of a saying reported of a modern judge that he had only lost two cases since he became a judge.

Similarly the reader will be surprised to read on p. 154 that Hortensius '*finit par mourir d'une maladie causée par son intempérance de parole*,'—no doubt a very proper punishment for such intemperance, but hardly to be established as a fact by Cicero's remark (wrongly quoted), *Hortensii vox exstincta fuit suo est, nostra publico* (*Brut.*, 96, 328). Another curious mistake seems to have been made on p. 267, where Cicero's mock-modest remarks on his own *Oratiuncula p. Dextero*, which he was sending to Dolabella (*Ad. Fam.*, ix., 12), are regarded as a severe criticism on Brutus' speech for the same king alluded to in *Brut.*, 5, 21, and consequently as proving that Cicero's praise of Brutus' eloquence was ironical,—a mistake quite incomprehensible if the whole letter be read, except on the assumption that for the moment Cicero's own speech was entirely forgotten.

A few other smaller errors or doubtful points might be pointed out, but they do not detract materially from the merits of the book, which ought to be one both interesting and useful to classical students.—J. E. NIXON.

HILDEBRANDT'S *Studien auf dem Gebiete der Römischen Poesie und Metrik*. I. VERGIL'S *Äußerer Aufbau*.

THIS is an elaborate attempt to find the true *Urbex*. The really critical part, the part which is valuable in itself and is in a great degree new and original, is to be found in sections I.—V. I will give as briefly as I can an abstract of the main arguments.

After the self-disparagement of *Cul.* 1—10, the pompous invocation 11 *sqq.* to Apollo and the Muses is unnecessary. It is also an obvious imitation of the Exordium of the *Aetna*. Consequently it cannot be by Vergil; though it bears unmistakable trace of imitation of Georgic i. Looking at the diction of 11—14 we seem to trace a Christian. *Sancto puer* (v. 26), which Catullus applies to Amor, could not be applied by a contemporary to the young Octavius. It could only be addressed to him from the standpoint of a later time, when he was recognised as a god. That it is however meant for *this* Octavius (not Musa, nor any ordinary man) is clear (1) because the poet's disclaimer of any attempt to write an

heroic poem implies a superior, no doubt a great person, to whom such an offering would be acceptable; (2) *meis allabere coeptis* is copied from *audacibus adnuc coeptis* of Georgic i., which is similarly addressed to Augustus; (3) *Gloria perpetuum lucens* bespeaks a man of high consideration.

Returning to 1—10, this Exordium also cannot be by Vergil; *iocos musamque = musam iocosam*, *Pondere culicis famaque = pondere famoso c.* would be from him, even at sixteen, impossible.

The real *Culex* begins with *Propulit e stabulis ad pabula lacta capellas* (45). From this to 57 (omitting, however, v. 50, which betrays an inexact observation of the goat quite alien to the real poet of the *Culex*) is by Vergil; changing, however, in 57 *præstanti* to *prostanti*. (This suggestion I have anticipated, *Journal of Philology* for 1886, p. 256.)

The section 58—97, in which a country life is eulogised, is quite out of keeping with the accurate nature-painting of the opening section. It smells of the lamp, and is an obvious copy of the famous *O fortunatos nimium sua si bona norint* of Georgic ii.

The real *Culex* meets us again at v. 98, and continues to v. 109. In this section only four changes are required, 99 *capras* for *curas*, 106 *restabant* for *residebant*, 108 *hibiscis* for *in umbras*. *Haud procul ipse exit* for *ut procul asperxit*. The rest is quite Vergil.

But with v. 110 begins once more the interpolator. He betrays himself partly by the suddenness with which we are told that the scene (hitherto apparently Italian) is laid in Boeotia; partly by the rush of mythological allusions — Agave, Pans, Satyrs, Dryads, Naiads, Orpheus, Demophoon, &c., &c.; followed by a long list of trees (seemingly based on Ovid *Metam.* x. 90).

The genuine poem begins again at 157, and continues uninterruptedly till 201. Vv. 202—204 are interpolated, as is shown (1) by the renewed pedantry of the mythological allusions; (2) the expressions *equos quatit, in fessos requiem dare comparat artus*; (3) the omission of any mention of the goats being driven to their afternoon-pasture, an indispensable preliminary in any exact observer of goat-nature, and one which Vergil (as we know from *Geor.* iii. 335) would have taken care to supply. But 206—209 are genuine; and with 209 ends this, the largest and central section of the genuine *Culex*.

Of the remainder of the poem, 213—414, only a few lines are Vergil's. The rest, occupied as it is with a lengthy description of the Infernal Regions (vv. 213—222, 232—384), is a subsequent addition. Vergil, even at the age of sixteen, could never have made his Gnat describe itself as *præda Charonis* while yet unburied. Yet how can it describe Tartarus, as it does, *without* such burial? As a whole, this episode, whilst feebly copied from *Aen.* vi., is greatly influenced by Christian ideas of Hell and Purgatory. It is difficult to say when it was written; possibly later than St. Augustine.

There are, however, pieces of this large section which are genuine. Vv. 210—212, 223—231, in which the Gnat complains of the goat-herd's ingratitude, and begs for a return of kind offices, *i.e.* in effect for a tomb, are a necessary sequel to the death of the serpent and the subsequent sleep of the rescued goat-herd, and may be accepted as Vergil's. Also 385—394, with a verse made up of the beginning of 395 and end of 411, then 412—414 form an unobjectionable finale.

Thus, after immense excisions, is obtained an ultimate *Culex* of 96 lines, symmetrically marked off into a centre or Omphalos of 48 vv. and two side-wings of 24 vv. each.

It is probable that few Englishmen will be prepared to accept a result so very sweeping. I must confess, for my own part, with all respect for Dr. Hildebrandt's care and ingenuity, that I cannot feel the sharply-marked difference of style which he finds in the genuine and non-genuine portions of the poem. If the work was written at all by Vergil, it would only be natural that a juvenile performance would present inequalities. If, again, any part of it was written by him, we should hardly expect the Vergilian portions to stand out against the non-Vergilian in the particular way which Dr. Hildebrandt supposes. For, in the first place, the work of Vergil at sixteen or eighteen would not necessarily be like his later verse; and, in the second, any one who added on to what he found of Vergil's would be more likely to catch the general style of all his works than the particular style of the *Culex*; the consequence of which would be, that the spurious portions were marked off from the genuine by a more elaborate rhythm, in which the caesuras, pauses and language of the Georgics and Aeneid were unconsciously or unavoidably imitated, producing a palpable inequality.

Again, is it true that we can distinguish two kinds of nature-painting in our *Culex*? Dr. Hildebrandt makes much of this, and recurs to it from time to time with great complacency. The poet of the one was an exact and minutely faithful copier of what he saw: the poet of the other was a closet-student, writing from the inspiration of his books and his night-lamp, and only painting as he had read. On the whole, I deny that any such sharp distinction exists here either. The assertion seems based on the description, 48 *sqq.*, of the goats browsing now in the woods and brakes, now in the valleys; now cropping the arbutus-berries, now raised on their hind-legs to seize a willow or alder bough. The passage is no doubt pretty, and will probably recur to most of those who read the poem through. But it does not seem to me more exact than the passage about trees which Dr. Hildebrandt condemns as spurious. Were I asked, indeed, to select what I consider the nearest approach to a minute word-picture, I should single out vv. 137—156.

Looking at the residuary *Culex* from the point of view of symmetry, we come upon another difficulty. If the sections were as carefully marked off from each other as Dr. Hildebrandt supposes

Side-wing.	Centre.	Side-wing.
(12 + 12.	12 + 12 + 12 + 12.	12 + 12),

in which, it will be observed, each of the parts is a multiple of 12, the uniformity of this segmentation would probably have been for greater clearness marked by some mechanical contrivance. Now granting that, after a time, this was lost or at least obscured, it would for all the time that the memory of it lasted, prevent any additions of so extensive a kind as we must suppose; for Dr. Hildebrandt's residuary original *Culex* is only 96 lines out of our extant 414. A forger would surely take care that his additions were not so violently out of proportion to the sum of what he found. If the *Culex*, say for two or three centuries, consisted of not more than 100 lines, the Christian who forged the additions (for this is the hypothesis) would never have swollen it out to more than 400.

I pass to a different part of the work, the emendations. These are numerous enough—more, indeed, than I for one can think at all necessary. Is it part of the present fashion to recur to the old style of Burges, who, it is said, carried 50,000 emendations with him in his carpet-bag?

The best of Dr. Hildebrandt's conjectures, I think, is in 172, *lucem iaculatur* for *lucens maculatur*; this is really clever, and may be right. Ingenious, too, is *Spiritus accessit uentis* in 189 for *excessit sensus*. The others do not, in my opinion, attain to anything like probability. But it will be seen from the analysis given above that our author does not deal with the text of more than one half of the poem. He seems, too, by no means master of all that has been written on the *Culex* within the last ten years; at least no reference is made to my articles in the *American and Cambridge Journals of Philology*, *A. J. Ph.* iii. pp. 271—284, *Camb. J. Ph.* vol. xv. p. 250 *sqq.*—ROBINSON ELLIS.

P. Vergili Maronis Bucolica Georgica Aeneis recognovit OTTO GÜTHLING. Teubner series. 1886.

DR. O. GÜTHLING, who is known to Vergil students by his recently-published *Curæ Vergilianæ* (Liegnitz, 1886), has been entrusted with the editing of the new Teubner text of Vergil, a task which he has performed with wise conservatism. His edition is well printed, and issued separately in two parts, one containing the Eclogues and Georgics, the other the *Aeneid*; and is moreover furnished with a concise apparatus criticus, containing the chief Ms. variations and most probable emendations. It forms a valuable appendage to Ribbeck's edition, as it contains the more recent contributions to the criticism of Vergil, which are scattered about in pamphlets and periodicals. Of three new MSS. noticed, the Pragensis supplies some important readings; the Oenopontinus and Daventriensis, in the words of the editor, 'plane inutiles sunt ad emendanda Vergili carmina,' and this verdict seems just, though in *Aen.* xii. 208 Dr. Güthling rather inconsistently, and perhaps unnecessarily, accepts *viro* for *imo* from the ed. Daventriensis. Much use has been made of the late Dr. Schaper's labours; and his clever emendation *certe* for *Uretae* has been printed in ec. i. 65. The editor's own emendations are rare; the ingenious *ulli* for *ullae* in *Aen.* xi. 567, deserves special notice. Dr. Güthling has discharged his duty with caution and acuteness, and has given us a text which deserves to become popular.—S. G. OWEN.

Eclogues of Calpurnius and Nemesianus, by C. H. KEENE, M.A. Deighton, Bell & Co. 1887.

MR. KEENE is already known as the editor of a selection from Ovid, and this little book will add to his reputation. The introduction discusses the authorship of the Eclogues, the date of the authors, the different MSS. and editions, and idyllic poetry generally. The literary criticism is perhaps rather heavy; 'the Mantuan bard' is a poor periphrasis for Virgil; but in dealing with matters of fact the editor is accurate and sensible. Mr. Keene does not profess to have contributed much to the criticism of the text; he follows generally Glaeser's edition of 1842; important various readings are given in critical notes inserted between the text and commentary. The explanatory notes are good and useful. No difficulties are passed over, and the solutions suggested are generally right. There are naturally slips here and there; *levat caput* (i. 10) is surely mistranslated; *tereti* (iv. 152) certainly is so; *ingra* (iv. 119) in *dum ingra versat orator* should not be translated 'broad acres,' but rather *long*, if 'acres' is to have any epithet at all. A note should have been given on an irregular form of condition which occurs ii. 71 and elsewhere, and on the irregular sequence of tenses in iv. 22, 23. The spelling of such forms as *coepit*, *querela*, *bacca*, should be corrected in a new edition;

but above all the note on p. 18 of the introduction: there is a hacknied line of Juvenal which all editors of school-books should keep in mind, and which might prevent vagaries of this kind. These defects do not impair the substantial value of the book which should prove very useful in the middle forms of schools.

Selections from Tibullus and Propertius, by Professor G. G. RAMSAY, M.A., LL.D. Clarendon Press. 6s.

THIS edition contains about six hundred lines of Tibullus and twice as many of Propertius, with introductions and notes. It is written in the first instance to meet the wants of students in Glasgow University; and the editor also wishes to do his part to "rescue from comparative neglect the best portions of two of the most fascinating and suggestive of Latin poets." This neglect is not so general or complete as the preface would give one to understand: there are schools and universities where Propertius at least receives as much attention as he deserves; for, when all is said, Propertius is not a Virgil, and must give way to Virgil and Virgil's peers if the multiplication of modern studies makes it impossible to study all the Latin poets. The biographies of the two poets are well written, and tell one shortly the little which is known or can be guessed with tolerable certainty about them. The account of the MSS. might have been omitted: students who read selections are not likely to care about the history of the text. The text given is in the main that of Palmer, as Professor Ramsay shares his belief in the superiority of the Neapolitan MS. Each poem is divided into paragraphs, and the drift of each paragraph is given in an English heading—an arrangement which does not improve the look of the page, but certainly facilitates the task of the student. The explanatory notes are copious, clear and sensible. Many of the longer notes on Tibullus are taken from a commentary published by the late Professor W. Ramsay, now out of print; they show erudition, but they are too long, and would be more in place in a Dictionary of Antiquities. On Propertius the editor has had the advantage of Professor Palmer's advice; a remarkable reading of his is printed on p. 80 (III. 18, 21). The least satisfactory notes are those on points of syntax: *hodiernæ* cannot stand for *hodie* (Tib. 1, 7, 53); nor can *veneranda* be used in an active sense (*ib.* 55). The indicative in general conditions, though of course perfectly regular, seems unfamiliar to the editor. There are a number of trifling misprints which might have been removed by a short study of the proof-sheets; the same line of Horace, for example, is quoted twice (pp. 106, 235), and there are three variations of text in six words. The editor is fond of quoting English poetry, and generally quotes it appositely, but he does not always assign his quotations to their right owners; it was not Herrick who said, 'There is no armour against Fate.'

We see that Professor Ramsay thinks very poorly of Munro's contributions to the study of Propertius; see especially p. 363. Now Professor Ramsay has a perfect right to disagree with and to disprove Munro's conclusions, but the tone which Professor Ramsay chooses to express his disagreement, will seem to many to be ill chosen.

Titii Livii historiarum Romanarum libri qui supersunt ex recensione IO. NIC. MADVIGH. Quartus ediderunt IO. NIC. MADVIGIUS et IO. L. USSINGIUS. Vol. II. Pars. I.

THIS is a continuation of the fourth edition of Madvig and Ussing's well-known text, containing books xxi.

to xxv. inclusive. All the experiments in emendation which have appeared since the third edition was published in 1880 have been carefully examined and weighed, and the result (for which sober-minded scholars will be thankful) is a text varying practically very little from that of the last edition. Perhaps the main use, one might almost say, comfort, of such a recension guaranteed by such an authority is indicated in the last sentence of the preface to this edition, where, after mentioning one or two emendations, admitted or approved, the editor continues, *In aliis locis nunc quoque unum id relinquebatur ut prava commenta arcerem.*

T. Livii Ab Urbe Condita, Libri I. II. XXI. XXII. Adjunctae sunt partes selectae ex libris III. IV. VI. Scholarum in usum edidit ANT. ZINGERLE. 1 M. 40 Pf.

THIS is a book intended especially to meet the requirements of Austrian Gymnasia. In the 'Instructions' issued in 1884, the portions of Livy recommended to be read in such schools are Books I. and XXI., with either Book XXII. or portions of the first decade illustrating the struggle between the Orders. Prof. Zingerle has accordingly here edited Books I. II. XXI. and XXII. in full, and three selections from Books III. IV. and VI.: (1) III. 33-55, the Decemviral legislation, and the downfall of the Decemvirs; (2) IV. 1-9, the Canuleian Rogations, the appointment of military tribunes with Consular power, and of Censors; (3) VI. 34-42, the Licinian Rogations, and the first election of a Plebeian consul.

Besides the text, the book contains two maps, one of Italy, the other in three divisions, Central Italy, the Ager Romanus, and the City, a brief account in Latin of the life and writings of Livy, and a geographical index.

There are no explanatory notes. The text adopted seems to be that of Weissenborn as last edited, but with a good many variations from it catalogued in an appendix, Prof. Zingerle adopting some conjectural emendations not admitted by Weissenborn or Madvig, as for example in I. 14, 11, *densis abditam virgultis* for *densa obsita virgulta*, XXI. 31, 11, *novosque gignit gurgites*. *Ob haec*, for *novosque gurgites* (*ob haec* &c.).

The book is scarcely calculated to be suitable for general use in English schools, but the selected portions supplemented from Book II. and carefully edited might form a very useful school book.

H. M. STEPHENSON.

Die Kriegszüge des Germanicus in Deutschland, von Dr. FRIEDRICH KNOKE, Oberlehrer am Herzogl. Karls-Gymnasium zu Bernburg. Berlin, 1887. 15 Mk.

THE author has devoted a book of no less than 566 pages to the elucidation of a subject, the interest of which to his countrymen is shown by the prefixed list of works consulted, containing the names of no less than sixty-eight predecessors who have treated the whole question or some part of it. The whole subject is here fully discussed from all its data, and illustrated by five maps showing the general field of operations and various parts on an enlarged scale.

It is hardly possible here to do more than indicate briefly some of the principal conclusions arrived at respecting the geography of the events related by Tacitus.

The locality of the attack on the Marsi in the autumn of A.D. 14, after the mutiny (1, 50, 51), has always been somewhat difficult to define, as that people, and some others mentioned with them, had

soon afterwards so far disappeared as to have no district assigned to them in the 'Germania.' Dr. Knoke thinks that the Marsi lived west of the Chatti and south of the Lippe, and that Germanicus, after marching eastward alongside that river, turned upon them unexpectedly by a flank march on the right through the forests southwards.

Passing over the expedition in the spring of A.D. 15 against the Chatti, and the movement (which Dr. Knoke thinks took place along the line of the Lippe) to rescue Segestes (1, 57, 4), we come to the great campaign of that year. It is argued in this work that the various divisions of the army, taking different routes to the Ems, formed a junction at or near Rheine; Caecina, having reached that place by a direct north-easterly route from Vetera, the main body having marched up to it from their landing-place at the mouth of the river.

The chief point of geographical interest in this campaign is the locality of the defeat of Varus, on which so much has been written at various times. It may be remembered that, while most authorities had placed the site at or near Detmold, others (as Nipperdey) had placed it as far westward as Stromberg or Beckum, and that Mommsen, in a separate treatise on the subject, and a short summary in his last great work (*R.G.* v. p. 43; Engl. Transl. i. p. 47), has placed it at or near Barenau, between the sources of the Hunte and the Dümmer See.

It is impossible here to give even an abstract of an investigation occupying some 100 pages of the work before us, and illustrated by a map which cannot here be reproduced. As to the author's reasons for placing the scene of the catastrophe at or near Iburg, south of Osnabrück, his criticism of the grounds on which Mommsen had placed it at Barenau, and the inferences to be drawn from the large discovery of Roman coins of the period in the latter locality, those who desire information must be referred to the book itself.

Another much-vexed question, to which considerable space is given, is that of the retreat of Caecina and his force (1, 63-69), and especially the situation of the 'pontes longi' (1, 63, 6). In the discussion of some six or seven different opinions on this point, and the reasons given for fixing the locality northward of the Dümmer See, it is to be feared that we have only attempts to solve an insoluble question; inasmuch as, though it may be assumed that Caecina had to make his way to Vetera, the point at which he was detached from the rest of the army to take a separate route is one on which Tacitus leaves us wholly in the dark.

In the expedition of the spring of A.D. 16, the chief geographical point is the situation of Aliso (2, 7, 5). Dr. Knoke agrees with those who place it at or near Hamm, rather than, with Mommsen (p. 31; Eng. Tr. i. p. 34), further eastward, at Elsen, near Paderborn. The other fort on the Lippe (2, 7, 1) must have been, he thinks, a little further on, at or near Dolberg.

In the account of the great campaign of that summer, much space is given to the discussion of another question on which Tacitus gives us no help, that of the point on the Ems at which the army disembarked from its sea voyage, and the route taken from that river to the Weser. It may perhaps be fairly safe to conclude that the Ems was left at some point not higher than Lathen, and the Weser reached somewhere near Minden. Dr. Knoke thinks that the left bank of that river was followed for some distance round the great bend which it there makes, and that the Romans crossed in some place or places south of the 'Porta Westphalica.' He further argues that the

Roman camp was formed on the rising ground opposite the village of Erder, facing eastward, and that the Germans had collected further east on the height of Arensburg, in the first part of which word he thinks a name of the German war god (the 'Hercules,' cf. 2, 12, 1) may be traceable. The plain into which they descended to battle he places at Eisbergen (in the first syllable of which name he would trace the two first syllables of 'Idistaviso'), opposite Rinteln. He supposes that the defeated army was pursued eastwards along the river, perhaps as far as Oldendorf, and that the trophy (2, 18, 2) may have been erected on the height of Papenbrink, overlooking the battlefield and whole surrounding district.

On the subsequent line of march, and the site of the second great battle of this campaign, Tacitus (2, 19-21) is again altogether vague. Dr. Knoke concludes, on general geographical and strategical considerations, that this battle took place also on the Weser, at a lower point, probably at Leese (about thirty miles below Minden), where some remains, which he thinks may be those of the boundary fence of the Angrivarii (2, 19, 4), have been discovered.

The above is necessarily a most meagre outline of the principal contents of the book, and does no justice to what appears to be a most careful study of the geographical and other questions involved, and a full exposition and discussion of all views differing from those adopted.

No Englishman can well be in a position to offer criticism of a treatise involving so much minute local knowledge of German geography. Students of Tacitus may be on the whole inclined to doubt whether Dr. Knoke, though at times dismissing statements as merely rhetorical, is not on the whole disposed to follow that author too closely into detail.

Without going so far as to pronounce him, with Mommsen, 'the most unmilitary of writers,' we must own that, besides the disadvantages under which all ancient historians labour in their attempt to represent, without maps before them, the geography of distant countries, Tacitus is peculiarly apt to conceive campaigns and battles rhetorically, to describe isolated events rather than connected movements, and to speak generally of local features, without such marks as might serve to identify them.

Hence it is that neither can German research reach certainty as to the sites of the Teutoburgensis Saltus or Idistaviso; nor will Englishmen ever satisfy themselves as to the locality of the last heroic struggles of Caractacus or Boudicca. Algerian students, if such there ever should be, will find themselves perhaps still more bewildered in the attempt to represent geographically the advances and retreats of Tacfarinas.

H. FURSEAU.

De Artium Scriptoribus Latinis. Scripsit FELIX BOELTE. Bonn. University Press. 1886. 1 Mk.

It is generally recognised by all scholars who have given any attention to the subject that a large amount of the grammatical treatises comprised in the *Corpus Grammaticorum Latinorum*, and now printed in Keil's edition, is a mere repetition of identical matter, which must in the long run be referred back to a few, probably a very few, common sources. The questions for criticism to settle are: (1) what these authorities were; (2) how far was their form modified in the process of redaction and repetition.

For that some considerable modifications took place is clear. It is not uncommon to find, in the various *Artes*, short passages of identical sense repeated with some slight variation of form; and long passages

treating twice, or oftener, of the same subject in successive paragraphs. Charisius indeed tells us in his preface that his studies have been *ex variis artibus inrigata*, and lets us generally see pretty plainly, in the course of his work, how it was composed. But even in Diomedes and Priscian, whose arrangement is far more lucid and logical than that of Charisius, the same phenomenon is visible. I would suggest that it is partly due to the fact that these *Artes* were originally composed as lectures, for the purpose of oral instruction. The quantity of such manuals doubtless increased as time went on, until by the fourth and fifth century A.D. they were tolerably numerous. Each *magister* would probably take some one manual as his basis, and add illustrations, fresh information, and statements of differing views, from other manuals or works of reference. Thus the lectures, in this imperfect form, would be put together and published as a book. Diomedes seems to imply something of the sort when he says to his friend Athanasius in his preface that his *ars meræ Latinitatis* is *trino digesta libello* *quia ipsos aurium meatus audita scientia complere absentia denegatum est*. The fragment of Donatianus, printed in Keil, vol. vi. p. 275, begins, *Ars grammatica accepta ex auditorio Donatiani*. And the commentaries on Donatus by Pompeius, Servius, and Sergius leave the same impression still more clearly, when, as they not unfrequently do, they add to the text of Donatus remarks from the older writers such as Pliny and Scaurus.

It is doubtful whether any really original *Ars Grammatica* was composed in Latin after that of Terentius Scaurus in the reign of Hadrian; and to assume that this was to any great extent original may be going too far. Scaurus had been preceded by Remmius Palaemon in the reign of Claudius and Nero. There was a great deal, indeed, of critical and lexicographical work done in the first and early second centuries, such as the collections of Valerius Probus, Pliny's book *Dubii Sermonis*, the commentaries of Caper, Asper, and the *Stromateus* of Caesellius Vindex. Scaurus may well have used much of the materials collected in these works. That his was the last really important *Ars Grammatica*, and that those which follow are mere variations and abridgments, seems to be shown by the fact that very few quotations indeed occur in the Latin grammarians later than Juvenal and Suetonius.

Dr. Boelte's essay examines in a very thorough way five treatises—those of Charisius, Diomedes, Donatus, Dositheus, and the *Excerpta Charisii* (or *Anonymus Bobiensis*). Starting from the undeniable fact that large parts of these treatises really represent one and the same work, Dr. Boelte sets himself to find out what this work was, and in what form it was known to the writers whom he is considering. After a careful and conscientious examination, a large part of which I have tested by verifying his references, he comes to the conclusion that the common source was a manual whose author's name has been lost. The author probably lived some two generations before Aelius Donatus; that is, at the end of the third century A.D., or thereabouts.

In the section on the Noun, however, there is a marked resemblance on the one hand between Charisius, the *Anonymus Bobiensis*, and Dositheus, and on the other between Diomedes and Donatus. The inference is that there were two recensions of the original manual, one of which was used by the first three writers just named, and the other by the two last.

In all the other sections, where Diomedes and Donatus agree, the same work is their common

authority; and parts of the other three treatises can be also referred to it, though the question here becomes more intricate.

The original work in question cannot have come either from Palaemon or Scaurus or Cominianus. But where its author and Cominianus agree, their agreement is to be accounted for by their use of the same authorities.

Dr. Boelte's general conclusion seems to me to be fairly made out both on its positive and on its negative side. That the passages in which these five treatises are virtually identical are derived from one source is quite clear: that no known writer, not Scaurus, or Palaemon, or Cominianus, is the author of this treatise seems equally clear. Certainly not Cominianus, for according to Charisius' repeated statements, he was a brief writer: certainly briefer than we must suppose the author of our (now) anonymous grammar to have been. And about the *Artes* of Palaemon and Scaurus we know too little to say with certainty to what exact extent they served as the bases of later manuals.

As is natural in such a case, I feel inclined to differ from Dr. Boelte on some points of detail. But students of this obscure corner of Latin literature will undoubtedly derive much assistance from his essay. It is to be hoped that he may pursue his investigations further with equal industry and success.—H. NETTLESHIP.

General Karte des Königreiches Griechenland, bearbeitet und herausgegeben vom K. K. Militärgeographischen Institute in Wien.

THE map published in 1852 by the French military survey has hitherto been the chief authority for the topography of Greece. The Vienna map, though on a smaller scale (1: 300,000) is so much superior in clearness and in the amount of information given, that it must take the first place. It is an admirable specimen of the best German workmanship. The mountains are marked in great detail with brown hatchings; the principal heights are marked in mètres; the outlines are at once elaborate and distinct. The survey of Macedonia and northern Epirus is unfortunately only partial. The map gives the towns, rivers, and roads, but no mountains. But even thus it adds to our information. Not only is it one of the few maps which give the course of the Haliacmon correctly: it gives quite a new view of the rivers and lakes of north-western Macedonia (Malik See, Presba See, &c.), and assigns a very different outline and proportions to the lake of Joannina (Dodona). The mountains of Aetolia and Arcadia have also gained much by revision. All modern roads, bridlepaths, and footpaths, are carefully marked, so that the map is invaluable to travellers. But will it be of much use to scholars? The answer is both yes and no. Those who have plenty of time and an eye for maps can extract from it a great deal of information. But to a casual observer it gives no distinct impression at all. There is so little level ground in Greece that the practice of marking every hill makes it impossible to distinguish relative heights. Until you look at the number of mètres marked upon a given hill it is almost impossible to guess whether its height is 500 feet or 5,000. Consequently the map gives no idea that Pindus, for instance, is a great barrier. It looks no more formidable than Oneium.

The praiseworthy desire to give information about roads has also interfered with clearness. Rivers and bridlepaths are only distinguishable by the superior straightness of the latter. Footpaths and the two kinds of boundaries also interfere with each other.

And rivers, roads, and boundaries, are continually broken by gaps for names to come across them. The river Inachos is thus broken ten times in as many miles, and never gets to the sea at all. This is specially unfortunate in a country where so many rivers go underground. The reader is continually suspecting *barathra*, only to find that his river has been engulfed in the name of a village.

The map is entirely modern. The lakes of Pheneus and Stymphalus, for instance, have their full modern extent, and the Peneius (Elis) its modern course. But in a large number of cases the ancient names of mountains and rivers are given in a different type. There are so many that one wonders why Maenalus and Thaumasion do not appear. And it is difficult to see why a courtesy extended to ancient mountains and rivers should be almost entirely denied to ancient towns.—M. G. GLAZEBROOK.

Akarnanien, Ambrakia, Amphilochien, Leukas, im Alterthum, von Dr. EUGEN OBERHUMMER, München, 1887. 10 Mk.

THE bulk of this book is historical. Dr. Oberhummer has, with immense industry, collected not only all references to Acarnania in the classics, but a great deal of information derived from coins and inscriptions. The result is a fairly consecutive account of the relations of Acarnania to other countries. It is likely to be very useful as a book of reference, but has only that kind of interest which attaches to the attempts to write the lives of Shakespeare's minor characters. Our author has patiently sought out all traits that could give individuality to the little country which he has taken under his protection. We find accounts of hunting, trade, arts and science, which read much like the chapter on snakes in Iceland. Under the heading of philosophy, for instance, we find that Acarnania claims that Cleombrotus, who after reading the Phædo threw himself into the sea, in order to settle in his own mind the question of immortality. More solid are the geographical introduction and appendix. They supply a useful catalogue of places which have been identified, and of the references to them in classical writers. The author has visited Acarnania, and is able to make some small corrections in the existing maps. The only change of importance which he proposes is that already suggested by Henzey, to transfer Sollium to a point a few miles inland to the west of the bay of Tavarda. The evidence which he offers for this seems very insufficient; but so is the evidence for placing it on the east of the same bay.—M. G. GLAZEBROOK.

Passages for Translation into Latin Prose. With an introduction by H. NETTLESHIP, M.A., Corpus Professor of Latin in the University of Oxford. Bell & Sons. 1887. 3s.

PROFESSOR NETTLESHIP'S book consists of sixty-three pieces for translation into Latin Prose, selected from various authors from Bacon to the late Rector of Lincoln. To this is prefixed an introduction in four parts, dealing with (1) the Latin representatives of some common English words expressing political and social ideas; (2) the range of metaphorical expression in Latin; (3) the development of classical style in Latin Prose; (4) cautions as to orthography. The first two parts necessarily cover only a small portion of the ground, and it is to be wished that Professor Nettleship could be prevailed upon to treat the subjects at greater length in a larger work. Some book is much wanted which would do for English what Nägelsbach's *Stilistik* does for German. The third part gives in a handy form lengthy quotations from

the fragments of Cato, C. Gracchus, Crassus the orator, etc., besides typical passages to illustrate the style of Cicero, Sallust, Livy and Tacitus. These quotations may, perhaps, prove valuable to teachers. There is a curious resemblance in some respects between the style of Cato and the style of the school-boy of to-day in the highest form of our public schools. If a boy can be made to see by an actual comparison of passages that his style in Latin is at least as far removed from Professor Nettleship's as Cato's from Cicero's, and what is more difficult, why this is

the case, we believe that a considerable difficulty will have been surmounted. Professor Nettleship's Latin versions are, as was to be expected, worthy of his reputation as a scholar; but in the matter of vocabulary and construction he shows a catholic taste, and certainly holds that salvation may be found in Quintilian as well as in Cicero. It is a pity that the proofs of the introduction have not been more carefully revised, as the book is disfigured by several bad misprints.—C. C.

NOTES.

ἀστός and αὐτός.—Cobet (*Variarum Lectiones*, ed. 2, p. 283) quotes undeniable instances of confusion between these words. I should like to add two other passages, in which well-known difficulties may be easily removed by assuming the same confusion.

(1) Dem. *Phil.* I. § 36 :

καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐμβαίνειν τοὺς μετοίκους ἔδοξε καὶ τοὺς χωρὶς οἰκοῦντας, εἴτ' αὐτοὺς πάλιν ἀντεμβιάζειν.

In our hurry and vacillation 'we first resolve that the resident aliens and freemen shall embark, and then again we determine—'; the rest is untranslatable. 'To put ourselves on board instead' has been half-heartedly given as a rendering; but how can αὐτοὺς be a reflexive (for ἡμᾶς αὐτούς)? And would such a turn of expression be in any case a likely one, when he might easily have said εἴτ' αὐτοὺς ἀντεμβαίνειν?

Westermann gives εἴτ' αὐτοὺς πάλιν, εἴτ' ἀντεμβιάζειν (absolutely, 'to change the crews').

Far better criticism I believe would be shewn in reading ἀστούς. 'First the freemen and resident aliens, and then citizens.' ἀστός is of course the proper term in opposition to μέτοικος.

(2) Aristophanes, *Eg.* 258-263 :

ἐν δίκη γ', ἐπεὶ τὰ κοινὰ πρὶν λαχεῖν κατεσθλείς,
ἡπόσυκάεις πιέζων τοὺς ὑπεύθυνους σκοπῶν
ὅστις αὐτῶν ὧμός ἐστιν ἢ πέπων ἢ μὴ πέπων,
κᾶν τιν' αὐτῶν γνῶς ἀπράγμων' ὄντα καὶ κεχηνύτα,
καταγαγὼν ἐκ Χερρονήσου, διαλαβὼν, ἀγκυρίσας,
εἴτ' ἀποστρέψας τὸν ὦμον αὐτὸν ἐνεκολήβασας.

Here is a grievous change of metaphor at v. 261,—from pulling figs to wrestling. To avoid recognising this change editors have attempted very far-fetched explanations of ἀγκυρίσας, ἀποστρέψας τὸν ὦμον, and ἐνεκολήβασας.

But there is a far more important difficulty which has been strangely overlooked. αὐτῶν of v. 261 refers of course to the ὑπεύθυνοι. But the term ὑπεύθυνοι implies previous tenure of office at or from Athens. How then can one of these office-holders be called ἀπράγμων and belong to the Chersonese? An ἀπράγμων is ὁ μηδὲν τῶν πολιτικῶν μετέχων (cf. Thucyd. ii. 40). Such a person cannot be ὑπεύθυνος.

Reading (in v. 261) ἀστῶν for αὐτῶν, we have Cleon's two sources of plunder, viz. :

(a) From the ὑπεύθυνοι at Athens.

(b) From quiet unsophisticated citizens (ἀστῶν) whom he blackmails—some country colonial in his clenchy away in Chersonesos. He can easily give such persons a fall.—T. G. TUCKER.

ON THE MEANING OF ἀρεῖη.—The word ἀρεῖη occurs thrice in Homer, and is not quoted again by Stephanus from any author of the classical period.

The meaning always given to it both by ancient and modern interpreters is that of *threatening*, but this is in reality based on only one of the three passages in Homer, *Υ.* 109 : λευγαλέοις ἐπέεσσιν ἀποτρεπέτω καὶ ἀρεῖῃ. Certainly no such sinister meaning would ever have been given to ἀρεῖη had it only occurred in the other two passages. They are P. 431 : πολλὰ δὲ μειλιχίοισι προσηύδα, πολλὰ δ' ἀρεῖῃ, and Φ 339 : μειλιχίοις ἐπέεσσιν ἀποτρεπέτω καὶ ἀρεῖῃ. In both of these ἀρεῖη is associated with 'gentle words,' and it is on the face of it far better to translate it 'prayer' than 'cursing,' and to derive it from ἀρή in the former sense. (It is true that ἀρή = *prayer* is always a spondee in Homer, but the change in the quantity proves nothing; possibly this misled the interpolator of the beginning of *Υ* and helped to allure after him the host of Homeric commentators).

Is the remaining line, then, *Υ.* 109, of sufficient authority to overthrow the inference naturally drawn from the use of this word in the other two places? Surely not. I need not here give any proofs of the late origin of the opening of *Υ*, the introduction to the notorious 'Second Theomachy'; they will be given, it may be presumed, abundantly in Mr. Leaf's second volume. I will only observe that the interpolator has in this line mistaken the meaning of another word as well, and that without any possible excuse; λευγαλέος cannot mean *terrible*, but only *mean*, *pitiful*; 'nunc asper, atroc' says Heyne rightly, but the dictionaries I have looked at are as unsatisfactory here as on ἀρεῖη. Indeed Liddell and Scott appear to have been puzzled about ἀρεῖη, as they only quote the line λευγαλέοις κ.τ.λ., saying 'cf.' the others (their references have got wrong), as though the other two were inconclusive as to the meaning.—ARTHUR PLATT.

PHILOSTRATUS, *Vita Apollonii*, i. 24.

καὶ τὰ γράμματα Ἑλλήνων μὲν, ἀλλ' οὕτω ταῦτα ἰδεῖν φασί.

Philostratus is speaking of the Eretrians who had been transplanted to a certain district; they used Greek characters, and their ancient tombs had Greek inscriptions on them. 'But,' according to the received reading, 'they say (*i.e.* Apollonius and Damis say) that they did not see these.' This makes the μὲν after Ἑλλήνων utterly meaningless, and besides why did they not see them as they were there? Read ταῦτα and translate: 'the characters were Greek indeed, but not the same to look upon.' This is just what we should expect, for these Eretrians had been there ἔτη ταῦτα πενταεξόσια, and the characters in question would either be Euboean of 500 years before or would have changed in a different manner from the other Greek alphabets, being entirely out

off from them; in either case they would appear strange to Greeks of the time of Apollonius.

There remains the difficulty that οὕτω on this view must mean nothing more than οὕ. But (α) this is also the case with the old reading, (β) Philostratus regularly uses οὕτω in this way. Cf. *Vita Apoll.* ii. 2: τὸ τῆς Μυκάλης ὕψος οὕτω μέγα, ii. 8: ὁ ποταμὸς οὕτω μέγας, ii. 12, *ad fin.*: οὕτω λέγοντες, ii. 15: οὕτω τεκμαίρεσθαι παρῆχον ἄν, iii. 48: πέτονται οὕτω μέγα, iv. 16: μηνύειν οὕτω ἀξιῶ (where you would rather expect οὐκέτι), v. 41: ἄλλα [ἄξια] οὕτω τῆς ἐπὶ τοσόνδε ὁργῆς,¹ vi. 9: οὕτω με ἤξiou, vi. 27: οὕτω μὲν ἑωρᾶτο, vii. 3: οὕτω ἀξιόλογα, vii. 28: οὕτω μεγάλα. Many other instances might easily be adduced, but these are the clearest I have observed; any one who will look at the passages in their context will be satisfied.

This use of οὕτω is indeed Homeric: see Leaf on *Iliad* iii. 306. I remember to have encountered some strange lucubrations arising from ignorance of this on the line in the *Odyssey*: οὐ γὰρ πω πάντεσσι θεοὶ φαίνονται ἐναργεῖς.

Philostratus, *Vita Apollonii*, iv. 7.

χρυσῶ πλείονι τοῦ * ὄντος.

‘Aliquid excidisse ante ὄντος significavi.’ Kayser. Read τοῦ δέοντος which gives the meaning wanted. Possibly τοῦ δέοντος was corrupted into τοῦ δὲ ὄντος and the δὲ then omitted. δεῖν has fallen out bodily in *Zosimus* iii. 15 and been restored by modern editors: ᾤετο γὰρ [δεῖν] μὴ περὶ μικρὰ διατρίβειν.

ARTHUR PLATT.

In his *Evangelium Palatinum* p. xxi. Tischendorf professes himself puzzled by a curious interpolation in Luke xxiv. 11. The text of Cod. Palatinus (which, like other Latin mss., omits v. 12) runs thus:—

et ceterae
quae cum ipsis
fuerant haec
dicebant ad
apostolos et
visa sunt an
te illos sicut de
leramentum (*sic*)
verba ista et

Non crede
bant illis LXX
VIII fuerunt
autem duo ex
illis euntes ip
sa die in castel
lum &c.

Tischendorf remarks that the number LXXVIII. is not likely to have arisen from any confusion with *Capitula* or *Canons*. Is it not possible that it rather stands for LXX VIRI, with reference to the tradition that both Cleopas and his companion were of the number of the Seventy (Cyril Alex.)? The gloss would then be introduced to explain *ex illis*, two lines below, which might otherwise seem to have for its antecedent *ad apostolos*. It would be quite in the manner of the Latin scribes to identify πᾶσι τοῖς λοιποῖς in v. 9. with the numerically definite body next in order to the Apostles.—W. SANDAY.

TWO MSS. AT PATMOS. I. *Macarius Chryscephalus*, a writer probably of the 14th century, compiled a Catena on S. Matthew, which is of value for the extracts which it contains from early Greek

¹ It is conceivable that Philostratus wrote ἄλλα τῆς ὁργῆς for ‘other pretexts not sufficient to excite such anger,’ but it is a great deal more likely that he wrote ἄλλα ἄξια οὕτω κ.τ.λ. and that the ἄξια fell out, as it easily might after ἄλλα.

Fathers. The work was in three books, each of which comprised twenty λόγοι. Hitherto, as far as I am aware, only the first book has been known to us. It lies, still unedited I believe, in the Bodleian Library (Cod. Barocc. 156, dated 1345 A.D.). When I was going to Patmos in the Easter vacation of this year to collate a MS. of the Philocalia of Origen, it was suggested to me by Dr. Hort that possibly a MS. which bore the name of Macarius might contain further portions of this work. This has proved to be the case. Codex 381 in the Monasterial Library contains the second book (S. Matt. viii. 5—xvii. 13). The first λόγος is entitled περὶ τοῦ ἑκατοντάρχου, and the twentieth ἡ μεταμόρφωσις τοῦ Χριστοῦ. The MS. was written in 1349, and has at the close some verses to Jeremiah on whose day (May 1) it was completed. It consists of 385 leaves, and contains passages from the following authors: Amphilocheus, Andreas Cretensis, Asterius, Athanasius, Basilus, Chrysostomus, Clemens Alex., Climacus, Cosmas, Cyrillus, Joh. Damascenus, Dionysius, Elias Cretensis, Ephraem, Epiphanius, Esaias Monachus, Eusebius, Gregorius Naz., Gregorius Nyss., Isaak Monachus, Isidorus, Marcus Monachus, Maximus, Methodius, Nicetas, Origenes, Symeon, Theophanes, Theophylactus, Zonaras.

2. *The Uncial Catena on Job* in the library at Patmos is probably the oldest representative of a large family of illustrated Catenae on this book. Its age is difficult to fix, but it is no doubt older than any of the cursives mentioned below. Hitherto those who have examined it have merely stated that it differed considerably from that published by Patrick Young—the Catena of Nicetas, which was also printed in Venice in 1792. It is indeed a wholly different work, though drawn to a great extent from the same sources. The Origen extracts correspond generally to those given by Galliciolus in the appendix to Gallandius, which are taken according to Morelli from the Venice MS. Marcian. xxi. These extracts are also found with considerable variants in three MSS. in the Bodleian:

Laudian. 30, saec. xii
Laudian. 20, saec. xiii
Miscell. 44, saec. xiii

None of these however has been copied from the Patmos MS. Indeed they diverge not only from it but from one another. The transcribers of these Catenae seem to have allowed themselves large license of curtailment and transposition: but notwithstanding this they still form a distinct group as contrasted with the Catena of Nicetas. Laudian. 30 and Miscell. 44 have no prefatory matter. Laudian. 20 begins with the short dissertation of Polychronius on the obscurity of Scripture, and has other prefaces besides. Judging from the catalogues I should expect that this last would correspond closely with

Paris, Coisl. exciv, saec. circ. xiii. (from Mt. Athos).
Florence, Laur. Plut. x Cod. xxix, saec. xiii.

Both of these contain the same dissertation of Polychronius. The study of Catenae is uninviting and laborious, and not always very promising. But future editors of Origen's exegetical remains will have to reckon with the Patmos Macarius and the Patmos Job; and I envy them at any rate the cordial welcome and the genial hospitality of the Monks of S. John.—J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON.

CLASSICAL EDUCATION IN FRANCE.

(Letter from a French University Professor.)

III.

Les établissements d'enseignement supérieur où, à côté d'autres études très diverses, les études classiques se poursuivent, sont : à Paris, l'École normale supérieure ; l'École pratique des hautes études ; le Collège de France ; la Faculté des lettres (à la Sorbonne) ; en province, quinze Facultés des lettres et une École supérieure (à Alger). Enfin, il faut nommer encore, bien qu'il ne s'y fasse pas d'enseignement à proprement parler, les Écoles françaises de Rome et d'Athènes. Tous ces établissements sont à la charge de l'État et sous la direction du ministre de l'Instruction publique. L'initiative privée n'a créé que fort peu de chose dans ce domaine. Quelques facultés catholiques peu prospères, malgré des débuts assez brillants, c'est tout ce qu'on peut mentionner.

Les élèves de l'École normale sont internes. Ils y entrent à la suite d'un concours. Ils y passent trois ans. Ils sont entièrement défrayés par l'État, et prennent, en retour, l'engagement de faire dix ans de service dans les établissements de l'État. Des conférences leur sont faites à l'École par des maîtres spéciaux ; en outre, ils peuvent suivre ailleurs des cours de leur choix. Ils ont à leur disposition, dans l'École, une très belle bibliothèque. Ils travaillent ou seuls ou par petits groupes, et sont personnellement guidés, conseillés, aiguillonnés par le directeur et le sous-directeur de la section des lettres, qui habitent au milieu d'eux. Ils sont soutenus en outre par une tradition qui se perpétue depuis près d'un siècle et par un esprit de corps qui se conserve chez chacun d'eux la vie durant. Triés au concours parmi les élèves les plus distingués de l'enseignement secondaire, entourés pendant trois ans des soins assidus de maîtres éminents, profitant sans aucun souci matériel de toutes les ressources intellectuelles d'une ville telle que Paris, astreints au travail par l'internement et stimulés par une sorte d'amour-propre collectif, affinant, polissant leur esprit par le frottement réciproque autant peut-être que par l'étude des livres et le commerce des professeurs, on comprend que ces jeunes gens acquièrent à bien des égards une supériorité dont ils se montrent justement fiers, et que ces mots d'ancien élève de l'École normale soient à eux seuls un titre dont on se prévaut volontiers même après avoir acquis une notoriété personnelle. C'est en général à la fin de la première année qu'on se présente à l'examen pour la licence ès lettres, et après les trois ans au concours d'agrégation. Nécessairement les études de la première et de la troisième année se font sous l'empire des préoccupations que donne la perspective de ces épreuves ; celles de la seconde année sont plus libres et bien des élèves savent faire un excellent usage de cette liberté. Mais le but de l'École étant de recruter le personnel enseignant des lycées, les études doivent être professionnelles, comme on dit ; elles doivent être faites de manière à former une élite de professeurs de l'enseignement secondaire ; elles doivent viser à assurer le succès des élèves aux examens. En conséquence on étudie les auteurs portés aux programmes de la licence et de l'agrégation ; on fait les exercices sur lesquels portent les épreuves à subir, dissertations françaises et latines, thèmes grecs, versions, compositions de grammaire, leçons sur des sujets donnés, etc. Pendant la troisième année, les élèves sont divisés en deux sections, la section de grammaire et celle de littérature, suivant

qu'ils aspirent à être placés un jour, comme professeurs au lycée, dans la division élémentaire ou supérieure. Enfin pendant leur séjour à l'École ils sont appelés chacun pour quelque temps à faire un petit apprentissage pratique en suppléant un professeur de lycée dans sa classe.

L'École des hautes études peut se comparer aux séminaires des universités allemandes, à l'imitation desquels elle a été fondée. Elle n'admet que des élèves sérieux, assidus, qui prennent part aux travaux des conférences. Elle ne leur demande ni d'où ils viennent ni où ils vont ; elle n'exige aucun certificat à l'entrée et ne prétend préparer à aucune carrière ; elle s'assure seulement qu'on est capable de suivre les cours auxquels on s'inscrit, et confère un diplôme qui n'a aucune valeur pratique. Elle n'est limitée ou contrainte, ni dans le choix des objets à étudier ni dans la manière de diriger ses exercices, par aucune considération de succès aux examens. Elle jouit de la plus entière et véritable liberté d'enseignement. Elle a des maîtres de premier ordre, en partie formés par elle-même. Ils font des conférences plutôt que des cours ; ils travaillent en commun avec leurs élèves, pour leur apprendre à travailler comme eux à l'avancement de la science, non pour leur transmettre une science toute faite. Les exercices portent sur la grammaire grecque et latine, la critique et l'interprétation des textes, la métrique, l'épigraphie, la paléographie, etc., mais sans suivre toujours un ordre systématique. L'École des hautes études a des élèves qui la considèrent comme leur vrai centre, sans s'interdire, bien entendu, de profiter des autres ressources du Paris érudit. En outre, tout ce qui a quelque goût pour la science pure, dans l'ordre des études classiques, à la Sorbonne et ailleurs, ne manque pas de pénétrer au moins temporairement dans ce sanctuaire de la philologie.

Le Collège de France n'est pas moins libre que l'École des hautes études. Les études classiques y sont représentées par une chaire de littérature grecque, et une de littérature latine, une de philologie latine, deux d'épigraphie et d'antiquités grecques et latines, une de philologie comparée, etc. Chaque professeur choisit à son gré la forme du grand cours ou de la conférence familière ; plusieurs font tour à tour l'un et l'autre. Chacun est libre de traiter les sujets qu'il veut, et de s'adresser au public qui lui convient. Aucun examen, ni d'entrée ni de sortie. Les professeurs eux-mêmes sont nommés sans autres titres que leur valeur scientifique, estimée par leurs futurs collègues et par l'Institut. Les cours relatifs à l'antiquité classique sont suivis par des étudiants de la Faculté des lettres, mais dans une ville comme Paris il y a assez d'autres éléments pour former un auditoire, et les professeurs du Collège de France ne sont nullement obligés de ménager les intérêts particuliers d'auditeurs menacés d'un examen à la fin de l'année.

Il n'en est pas de même des Facultés des lettres. Leurs élèves sont soit boursiers de l'État, soit maîtres répétiteurs ou maîtres auxiliaires des lycées, soit enfin étudiants libres. Mais la plupart ont pris le même engagement décennal que les élèves de l'École normale ; presque tous se destinent à l'enseignement et doivent, pour pouvoir être placés dans les collèges et lycées, obtenir les titres de licenciés et d'agrégés. Ils sont donc astreints à préparer des examens, à travailler d'après un programme, comme les élèves de l'École normale ; chaque faculté renferme dans son

sein comme une petite école normale. Il faut que les élèves fassent dans le courant de l'année un certain nombre de dissertations, de thèmes, de versions, etc., afin de pouvoir subir avec succès les épreuves écrites des examens. Il faut qu'ils étudient les ouvrages d'auteurs français, latins et grecs, sur lesquels ils seront examinés. Enfin les candidats à l'agrégation doivent s'exercer à faire des leçons sur des sujets donnés. Les professeurs de faculté sont tenus de diriger ces exercices et de corriger ces différentes compositions, et naturellement ils choisissent, pour les traiter dans leurs cours, les sujets dont la majorité des étudiants doivent s'occuper en vue de leurs examens. Il en résulte que certains cours s'adressent plus particulièrement aux candidats à la licence, d'autres aux candidats à l'agrégation ; beaucoup aussi servent à tous également ; plusieurs enfin sont faits à la fois pour les étudiants et pour le public de la ville. Il y a généralement à chaque faculté un cours d'histoire de chacune des littératures, française, latine et grecque ; un cours de grammaire latine et un de grammaire grecque ; un autre de grammaire française historique ; un cours ou des exercices de métrique ; un cours sur les institutions grecques et romaines ; enfin des leçons assez nombreuses consacrées à l'explication des auteurs, que le professeur tantôt fait lui-même, tantôt fait faire à ses élèves en les dirigeant et les corrigeant. Voici, pour vous donner une idée des auteurs qu'on étudie dans les facultés, les programmes de licence (trisannuel) de 1887 à 1889, et d'agrégation (annuels) de 1886 à 1887.

Licence ès lettres.—*Chanson de Roland*, 2164 à 2396. Joinville, *Saint Louis*, ch. 32 à 46. Montaigne, *Des Livres*. Corneille, *Polyeucte*, *Nicomède*. La Fontaine, *Fables*, l. vii. et viii. La Rochefoucauld, *Maximes*. Molière, *Les Précieuses Ridicules*, *Tartuffe*. Pascal, *Pensées*, art. 7 et 8. Bossuet, *Sermons sur l'Honneur du Monde et sur la Mort*. Boileau, *Art poétique*, i. et iii. Racine, *Britannicus*. La Bruyère, *Les ouvrages de l'esprit*. Voltaire, *Choix de lettres*. Ténence, *Les Adelphe*. Lucrèce, i. 1 à 700. Virgile, *Géorgiques*, i. ; *Énéide*, viii. et ix. Horace, *Odes*, iii. ; *Épîtres*, ii. ; *Art poétique*. Cicéron, *pro Archia* ; *ad Q. f. i. 1* ; *de finibus*, I. T. Live, xxi. ; Tacite, *Histoires*, ii. Quintilien, x. 1. Homère, *Odyssée*, xi. Pindare, *Pythique* 4. Sophocle, *Oedipe roi*. Aristophane, *Les Nuées*, 1 à 1104. Hérodote, viii. 71 à 144. Thucydide, vii. 62 à 87. Platon, *Phédon*, 1 à 34. Démosthène, *Olythiennes*, i. et ii. Théocrite, *Les Syracusaines*.

Agrégation des lettres.—Corneille, *Polyeucte*. Rotrou, *Saint Genest*. Racine, *Phèdre*. Molière, *Critique de l'École des femmes* ; *Impromptu*. Boileau, *Épîtres*, 1 et 5 à 11. Montaigne, *Essais*, iii. 8 et 9. Bossuet, *Discours sur l'Histoire universelle*, iii. 5 à 8. *Sermons sur la Providence et sur la Pensée de la Mort*. Bourdaloue, *Sermons* sur les mêmes sujets. Montesquieu, *Grandeur et Décadence*, 13 à 19. Virgile, *Énéide*, vi. Horace, *Épîtres*, ii. 1 et 2. Ovide, *Fastes*, i. Lucain, vii. 1 à 711. Cicéron, *de officiis*, iii. ; *pro Archia* ; *pro Roscio comedo*. César, *Guerre Civile*, iii. 80 à 112. T. Live, xl. 1 à 24 et 54 à 59. Tacite, *Dialogue*. Homère, *Odyssée*, xi. Sophocle, *Oedipe roi*. Euripide, *Médée*. Apollonius, *Argonautiques*, iii. 609 à 1162. Théocrite, *Les Syracusaines*. Thucydide, vii. 42 à 87. Platon, *Phédon*, 1 à 34. Démosthène, *Sur l'Ambassade*, 177 à 343.

Agrégation de grammaire.—*Chanson de Roland*, 603 à 803. Constans, *Chrestomathie, Serments de Strasbourg* ; *Prose de Sainte Eulalie* ; *Amis et Amiles* ; Villehardouin. Montaigne, ii. 10, et iii. 8. Corneille, *Polyeucte*. Racine, *Phèdre*.

Molière, *Les Précieuses Ridicules*. Bossuet, *Discours sur l'Histoire Universelle*, iii. 5 à 8. Voltaire, *Lettres Choies de 1750 à 1760*. Virgile, *Énéide*, vi. Horace, *Épîtres*, ii. 1 et 2. Ovide, *Fastes*, i. César, *Guerre Civile*, iii. 80 à 112. Cicéron, *pro Archia* ; *de officiis*, iii. T. Live, xxii. Tacite, *Dialogue*. Homère, *Odyssée*, xi. Sophocle, *Oedipe roi*. Euripide, *Médée*. Théocrite, *Les Syracusaines*. Thucydide, vii. 42 à 87. Démosthène, *Sur l'Ambassade*, 177 à 343. Plutarque, *Démosthène*.

Il est évident que ces ouvrages sont trop nombreux pour être tous expliqués à la faculté. Il faut que le professeur en choisisse quelques-uns, à propos desquels il montre le chemin, la méthode : aux étudiants de voir le reste entre eux ou chacun pour soi. De même en fait de grammaire, d'histoire littéraire, etc. ; le cours, qui est d'une heure par semaine, ne peut embrasser plus que quelques chapitres de ces vastes matières. Une fois initié, l'étudiant doit compléter ses connaissances et développer ses aptitudes à l'aide de lectures et, en quelque mesure aussi, de recherches personnelles.

Ce dernier mot touche le point faible des études telles qu'elles se font actuellement dans les facultés des lettres. Les étudiants les plus capables et les plus avancés, ceux qui approchent des examens et surtout de l'agrégation, c'est à dire justement ceux qui seraient en état de s'élever à des études vraiment supérieures, ont à parcourir chaque année un programme aussi étendu que vous venez de le voir, et à fournir toute une série de devoirs d'écoliers, thèmes, versions, etc. ; il est bien difficile qu'ils trouvent à côté de cela le temps et la force de se livrer à d'autres travaux plus personnels et propres à les initier aux investigations scientifiques. Il faudrait, pour que cela devint possible à tous ceux qui en auraient le goût transformer le concours en examen de capacité, ou tout au moins supprimer le programme annuel et remplacer les compositions dont j'ai parlé par des épreuves plus sérieuses. Pourtant, même dans l'état actuel, on a parfois la satisfaction de voir un étudiant collationner un manuscrit et en déterminer la valeur ; corriger ou interpréter un texte désespéré ; creuser un problème de grammaire ou d'histoire littéraire ; mais ce sont forcément aujourd'hui des exceptions. Le temps et l'énergie de la majorité des étudiants sont absorbés par le travail imposé, et quelquefois bien terre à terre, de la préparation directe aux examens.

Pour être juste, il faut ajouter, que ce même système d'études a l'avantage d'empêcher qu'on se spécialise trop tôt, au détriment des connaissances générales, et de développer chez les étudiants des qualités précieuses pour l'accomplissement de leur future tâche. Soumis à cette espèce d'entraînement tout pratique, ils deviennent eux-mêmes habiles à faire les exercices qu'ils auront à diriger chez leurs élèves, et ils acquièrent l'art de la composition et le don d'exposer avec ordre, clarté et agrément.

On a beaucoup fait, depuis quelques années, pour créer et perfectionner les instruments de travail, manuels, dictionnaires, éditions d'auteurs, etc. En jetant un regard sur la bibliothèque de l'étudiant, vous vous ferez une idée de ce que sont ses études en dehors des cours.

M. S. Reinach a publié en 1880 un manuel embrassant tout l'ensemble des études classiques sous le titre de *Manuel de philologie classique*. C'était primitivement un résumé du *Triennium philologicum* de W. Freund, mais qui a subi des modifications importantes et s'est fort élargi en deuxième édition. L'auteur a accumulé dans deux volumes une quantité immense de faits et de noms propres (pas tous également sûrs, naturellement), sans qu'il en résulte

aucune sécheresse ; au contraire, son livre est d'une lecture attrayante, et ne peut qu'inspirer le désir d'approfondir les innombrables sujets d'études qui y sont esquisés. Les différentes branches de la vaste science esquissée par M. Reinach ont aussi leurs manuels, dont plusieurs traduits de l'allemand, comme Ottfried Mueller, *Histoire de la Littérature grecque* ; Teuffel, *Histoire de la Littérature latine* ; Curtius, *Grammaire grecque* ; Madvig, *Grammaire latine, et Syntaxe grecque* ; Buecheler, *Déclinaison latine* ; Guhl et Koner, *Vie privée des Anciens* ; Friedlaender, *Mœurs romaines* ; Preller, *Mythologie*, etc. ; puis une série de petits traités destinés proprement aux classes supérieures des lycées, mais plus souvent peut-être consultés à la faculté : Brambach, *Orthographe latine (Hilfsbüchlein)* ; L. Mueller, *Métrique grecque et latine* ; Schiller, *Mètres d'Horace* ; Seuffert et Bamberg, *Syntaxe grecque* ; Kraner, *L'Armée romaine* (tiré de l'introduction à son *César*) ; Berger, *Stylistique latine* ; Meissner, *Phraséologie latine* ; Bender, *Histoire de la Littérature latine* ; Mahaffy, *Archéologie grecque* (traduit de l'anglais), etc. Parmi les ouvrages écrits en français, les étudiants s'en tiennent aussi trop volontiers à ceux qui sont destinés plutôt à des écoliers, Pierron, Nageotte ou Deltour pour l'histoire des littératures, Chassang pour la grammaire, Robiou et Delaunay pour les Institutions, etc. Ces livres, dont quelques-uns ont des qualités incontestables, mais qui ne sont pas à la hauteur d'un enseignement vraiment supérieur, sont remplacés peu à peu par des traités plus complets et plus propres à servir à la fois de répertoires et d'introduction à des études personnelles. Pour les seules institutions romaines, il existe trois excellents ouvrages, auxquels vient de s'ajouter la traduction de Mommsen et Marquardt : Willems, *le Droit public romain* ; Misoulet, *les Institutions politiques des Romains* ; et Bouché-Leclercq, *Manuel des Institutions romaines*. L'épigraphie grecque et romaine ont fait l'objet de deux publications estimables de MM. S. Reinach et R. Cagnat. MM. Alfred et Maurice Croiset ont entrepris d'écrire une nouvelle histoire de la littérature grecque, dont le premier volume, consacré à Homère et Hésiode, vient de paraître et fait très bien augurer de l'ensemble. La syntaxe latine a été traitée presque simultanément par MM. Antoine et Riemann, ce dernier plus original, l'autre plus complet et sur certains points plus clair. Le cours élémentaire de métrique grecque et latine de M. Louis Havet, remarquable par sa clarté, sa concision et sa précision, dispensera désormais de se servir de la petite métrique de L. Mueller, si peu digne de l'auteur du *de re metrica*. La mythologie grecque est représentée par le beau livre de M. Decharme. Le *Dictionnaire des Antiquités* de Daremberg et Saglio, si bien rédigé et si abondamment illustré, offre une riche source d'informations ; malheureusement il paraît très lentement et en est encore aux premières lettres de l'alphabet. La *Paléographie des Classiques latins*, de M. Châtelain, est bien faite pour introduire à cette étude, si utile, si nécessaire, et pour en donner le goût. Nous manquons de bons dictionnaires grecs et latins, car celui de Freund traduit par Theil est trop cher pour les étudiants, et les autres sont par trop élémentaires. Le meilleur incontestablement est celui de Theil, mais il est beaucoup moins répandu que celui de Quicherat, qui est fort médiocre. Heureusement, on a confié à un savant très compétent, M. Châtelain, le soin de le refondre entièrement. Quant au *Thesaurus Poeticus* de Quicherat, c'est un ouvrage très soigné, très digne de confiance et fort utile, non pas seulement pour la versification. En fait de dictionnaires grecs, on a Alexandre et Chassang, l'un fort ancien, l'autre tout moderne, l'un et l'autre

très insuffisants. MM. Bréal et Bailly, sous le titre de *Dictionnaire Étymologique Latin*, ont donné un excellent supplément aux dictionnaires latins. Ils n'indiquent que les étymologies à peu près incontestables, avec des explications qui peuvent servir d'introduction à l'étude de la morphologie ; et ce qui est peut-être plus remarquable et non moins utile, c'est la déduction des différentes acceptions des mots, appuyée sur un heureux choix d'exemples. Je vous ai parlé des éditions d'auteurs anciens faites pour les classes. Il en existe aussi quelques-unes destinées à des lecteurs plus avancés et auxquelles les étudiants recourent volontiers, comme le *Sophocle* de M. Tournier, le *Démosthène* et l'*Euripide* de M. Weil, le *Virgile* de Benoist, les *Discours de Cicéron* de M. Thomas, etc.

À côté de ces livres, qui sont les livres à consulter, à feuilleter à tout propos, ou à étudier à fond, il faudrait citer une série de lectures très recommandées aux étudiants, et généralement goûtées par eux, telles que l'*Essai sur Tite-Live* de M. Taine ; Boissier, *Cicéron et ses amis* ; Martha, *le Poème de Lucrèce* ; Patin, *les Tragiques grecs* ; J. Girard, *l'Éloquence attique* ; Fustel de Coulanges, *la Cité antique*, etc., etc. Enfin, on cherche avec plus ou moins de succès à familiariser les étudiants avec les grandes collections savantes, avec les travaux spéciaux et de première main sur les auteurs qu'ils ont à expliquer et sur les questions d'histoire littéraire, d'antiquités, ou autres, qui peuvent se poser au cours de leurs travaux. Ces efforts rencontrent des obstacles de différente nature. D'abord, les auteurs portés aux programmes sont beaucoup trop nombreux pour qu'on puisse en faire une étude approfondie et prendre connaissance même des travaux les plus importants qui les concernent ; puis, la plupart des livres et des mémoires qu'il faudrait lire sont écrits en allemand, d'autres en anglais, et beaucoup d'étudiants ont de la peine à comprendre ces langues ; enfin, en province du moins, les bibliothèques sont encore bien pauvres et mal administrées, en sorte que, de douze ou quinze travaux spéciaux qu'on aurait à consulter sur telle question, on en aura, si tout va bien, deux ou trois à sa disposition au moment voulu.

Telles sont en France les ressources offertes à ceux qui se vouent à l'étude de l'antiquité classique. J'ai dit que ce sont presque tous de futurs membres du corps enseignant. Il n'y a guère à côté d'eux qu'un nombre assez restreint d'étudiants en droit ou en théologie protestante, qui recherchent la licence ès lettres comme une recommandation dans leur carrière ou comme une ressource en cas de besoin. On compterait bien moins de personnes encore qui font ces études pour le seul plaisir de s'instruire. Ces personnes suivront plutôt des cours de sauserit, d'arabe, de chinois, ou simplement d'histoire et de philosophie. Les études classiques—ce n'est peut-être pas un mal—sont laissées aux gens du métier. De ceux-ci beaucoup n'essaient pas de s'élever au-dessus de la licence. Une cinquantaine chaque année sont admis à l'agrégation. Les élèves de l'École normale y réussissent presque toujours, et tiennent le plus souvent la tête. On a vu cependant et l'on voit plus fréquemment d'année en année, les étudiants de la faculté de Paris, et même de certaines facultés de province, lutter avec eux victorieusement et arriver en nombre jusqu'aux premiers rangs. Les plus distingués des agrégés et quelques-uns qui passent à côté de l'agrégation pour aller droit au doctorat, deviennent parfois de vrais savants. Je n'en nommerai qu'un, parce qu'il est mort, hélas ! c'est Charles Graux. Vous connaissez ses travaux, et vous pouvez juger par lui de ce que nos écoles sont en état de produire.

Parmi ces jeunes gens de talent supérieur, quelques-uns sont désignés chaque année par les établissements qui les ont formés pour être envoyés à Rome ou à Athènes comme membres des écoles françaises de ces villes. Les années qu'on y passe sont le véritable couronnement des études classiques. C'est là que d'élève on devient maître. C'est là qu'on apprend à chercher, à découvrir, à faire la lumière. Il n'y a plus ni cours ni conférences à suivre. Chacun entreprend un travail pour lequel il reçoit les conseils et l'appui du directeur, mais qu'il accomplit librement et sous sa responsabilité propre. Ce sont tantôt des recherches faites dans les bibliothèques et les musées, tantôt des fouilles pratiquées dans le sol, tantôt des excursions ou des voyages d'exploration archéologique ou épigraphique. Ces travaux font l'objet de rapports annuels adressés à l'Institut. Le plus souvent aussi ils donnent lieu à des publications spéciales. Deux périodiques, le *Bulletin de Correspondance hellénique* et

les *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire*, ont été créés pour recevoir celles de moindre dimension. D'autres, plus étendues, deviennent des thèses pour le doctorat, ou des fascicules de la *Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome*. On voit que ces écoles ne sont pas tant des écoles que des Instituts. Ce sont de petites corporations savantes, entretenues par la France dans les deux centres de l'ancien monde et chargées de travailler sur place à le faire revivre. Si on leur a donné cependant le nom d'écoles avec raison, c'est qu'une école est un lieu où l'on apprend, et qu'il n'est guère de lieu où l'on apprenne plus et mieux que là. C'est de Rome et d'Athènes que nous sont revenus, dans les jeunes générations, la plupart de ceux qui ont fait faire quelque progrès aux études grecques et latines, en particulier à l'archéologie et à l'épigraphie, qui y sont naturellement le plus en honneur.

UNIVERSITY INTELLIGENCE.

OXFORD.

DERBY SCHOLAR — G. R. Northcote, New (Winchester).

LINCOLN, *Professor Fellow*, P. Gardner, Ch. Coll. Camb., (City of London), *Professor of Classical Archaeology*.

MERTON, *Fellows* (Cl.), W. Ashburner, Balliol

(Univ. Coll. School); L. T. Hobhouse, C. C. C. (Marlborough).

NEW COLLEGE, *Fellow* (Nat. Sc.), G. C. Bourne, New (Eton).

TRINITY, *Australian Scholar*, H. S. R. Thornton (Harrow).

CAMBRIDGE.

Dr. Swainson, the late Master of Christ's and Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, was best known to theologians by his studies on the Creeds and the materials he had collected for an edition of the Greek Liturgies. The new master (Dr. Peile) is Reader in Comparative Philology, and author of the *Introduction to Greek and Latin Etymology*. Dr. Hort has succeeded to the Lady Margaret Professorship.

It is proposed to send out Dr. Guillemard and Mr. H. B. Smith to commence archaeological explorations in Cyprus. The Worts Fund could not be better employed than in aiding this enterprise.

The introduction of the reformed pronunciation of Latin is authoritatively proclaimed, and lectures have been already given for the purpose of explaining and enforcing it.

The Heads of Houses will appoint, on Nov. 30, to the Disney chair of Archaeology, vacant by Dr.

Gardner's election at Oxford. We hear that Mr. Cecil Torr is likely to be a candidate.

TRINITY, *Fellows* (Math.), W. F. Sheppard, B.A. (Charterhouse); W. P. Workman, B.A. (Kingswood).

CLARE, *Scholar* (Math.), H. M. Macdonald (Aberdeen).

CAIUS, *Sen. Fellows* (Math.), J. W. Sharpe (Derby); *Fellow* (Nat. Sc.), C. S. Sherington (Ipswich); *Scholars* (Mod. and Mediaev. Lang. and Lit.), E. L. Milner-Bury; W. Kippmann (Dulwich).

ST. CATHERINE'S, *Scholars*, W. A. Crabtree (Canterbury); G. A. Anning (Cheltenham Grammar School); T. W. Morgan; H. E. Farrell (Vict. Coll., Douglas, Isle of Man).

JESUS, *Scholars* (Math.), S. G. W. Stephenson (Loughborough); (Hist.), C. N. Clapcott (Newton Abbot).

ARCHAEOLOGY.

HARROW SCHOOL MUSEUM.—(1) *Catalogue of the Egyptian antiquities from the collection of the late Sir Gardner Wilkinson*: by E. A. WALLIS BUDGE, M.A.

(2) *Catalogue of the Classical antiquities from the collection of the late Sir Gardner Wilkinson*: by CECIL TORR, M.A. Harrow, 1887. London: D. Nutt. 1s. each.

HARROW SCHOOL is fortunate in having found no less than three benefactors interested in its archæo-

logical welfare. Sir Gardner Wilkinson many years ago transferred to Harrow School by gift during his lifetime, and by bequest on his death, a collection which comprises amongst other things two large series of Egyptian and classical antiquities; though not complete in themselves, these two series furnish excellent typical material for the study of Egyptian and Greek archæology, and form a nucleus around which it is hoped a fuller gallery of illustration may in course of time be gathered.

These collections were for a long time stowed in the Vaughan library, and have now found a new home in the museum recently erected by the Governors. The conditions of the bequest provided that the collections 'should be placed as soon as possible in a suitable and convenient place belonging to the said Governors of Harrow School.' Yet at the beginning of this year absolutely nothing had been done for their proper exhibition. In view possibly of another stipulation 'that they be not dispersed,' the archaeological antiquities were huddled into two or three wall-cases, which they shared with fossils and other natural history specimens; this arrangement, however interesting from a natural history point of view, was hardly what Sir Gardner would have called 'suitable and convenient.'

After infinite trouble Mr. Cecil Torr succeeded in obtaining permission to take the collections in hand, and it is due to his energy and generosity that Harrow is now in a unique position as compared with other schools which have or have not a museum. The collections have been scientifically arranged, mounted, and exhibited, and the excellent catalogues above mentioned have been drawn up at the instance and expense of Mr. Torr.

These catalogues are modelled on a plan which is likely to initiate a new epoch in the study of archaeology in our public schools. The works of both Mr. Budge and Mr. Torr give us elaborate and careful catalogues which supply all that professed archaeologists are likely to require; but they are furthermore practical manuals of the subjects they deal with, calculated to interest and instruct even the most wilfully ignorant in these subjects; and in this connection they will be most welcome in other schools beside Harrow. Mr. Budge, for example, with the abundant assistance of a beautifully clear hieroglyphic fount, makes his classification of scarabæi, Ushabtiu figures, deities, sacred animals, &c., and a short introduction to the study of each branch of his subject; while two very important lists are added, giving (pp. 6-8) the common phonetic, syllabic and determinative signs, and (pp. 87-104) the principal kings, with their cartouches and dates (after Brugsch) down to B.C. 358.

Mr. Torr's remarks have a similar value for the Greek vases, terracottas and bronzes: prefaced by a vigorous setting forth of the claims of archaeology as 'the only outcome of classical education (apart from the unrivalled training of the mind) by which a man is likely to set much store when he is past five-and-twenty,' and some useful remarks as to the choice of the literature of the subject. For general purposes it is worth noting that this collection contains *inter alia* the following vases of interest: nos. 23, 24. Two unpublished Panathenaic amphore. 50. Krater r. f. with Kaineus in Centauromachia. 52. Kylix r. f. with seven Theseus scenes in interior and four repeated on exterior. 53. Kylix r. f. with exterior and interior in style of Epiktetos: 'Αἶσα[ς] καλός. 55. Amphora r. f. Satyrs holding armour, style of Duris. 56. Oinochoe, r. f. boy with hoop and stick, style of Hieron.—GEOFF. SMITH.

BRITISH MUSEUM.—The conversion of the old Print Room into a gallery of sepulchral monuments announced in the June number of this *Review* (p. 176) has progressed so far that the gallery is now open to the public. When the temporary floor has been replaced later on by a permanent floor about six feet lower down, the reliefs which have been built into their permanent places in the walls will be seen from a more satisfactory point of view, and the smaller reliefs which are now ranged in rows in the centre of the room will be placed round the walls below

these. Some large sarcophagi will then be placed along the centre.—C. T.

In the *Jahrbuch* 1887 p. 145, Studniczka is inclined to suppose from his reading of an artist's name Γλησιδῆς or Μλησιδῆς that the same name is traceable on the alabastron from Cyprus recently acquired by the British Museum (see *Classical Review* 1887, p. 26). I have already pointed out that there are good reasons for reading Πλασιδῆς and no more. The vase in question will be published in colours in the forthcoming number of the *Hellenic Journal* by Mr. Murray, who agrees entirely with me on this point.—C. S.

Jahrbuch des k. deutschen Arch. Inst. 1887: part 3. Berlin.

1. Conze: bronze statuette of Hermes, in possession of Herr v. Radowitz: in left hand has been kerykeion, in right is a ram's horn and ear: markings in silver: plate and cut. 2. Studniczka: (a very important article): (i.) restores statue by Antenor on the base inscribed with his name: the Naples group of the Tyrannicides must be referred to Antenor, not, as was supposed, to Kritios and Nesiotes: the Nearchos here noted is not the potter of that name, although traces of dedications of their wares by known vase-artists have been found. (ii., iii.) The early history of painting as given by Pliny is actually borne out by evidence of vases, if we assign (iv.) the commencement of r.f. painting to the time of the Peisistratidæ: a conclusion confirmed by references on vases to individuals of that period: one plate, eleven cuts. 3. Dümmler: an Attic lekythos from Cyprus: between the revolt of Onesilos and B.C. 449 no Attic importations to Cyprus were possible; so that the r.f. vases found there must be referred to the sixth century. Probably the introduction of the r.f. style is contemporary with an early stage of b.f. painting. Relation of vase-painting to Polygnotos: denies strong influence of Parthenon sculptures on vase painting: plate. 4. Robert: bronzestatue of a kottabos-man in Berlin Museum: cut. 5. Sittl: the Hesiodic shield of Herakles; the descriptions are not merely poetic fancies, but correspond with the art and technique of the beginning of the seventh century, at which time we may imagine a similar actual shield to have existed: it points strongly to a Boeotian, perhaps Theban, original. 6. Belger: note on the bronze statue of a boxer recently found in Rome. 7. Morgenthau: a vase described in *Bullet.* 1873, p. 169, and now in Metropolitan Museum of New York: the so-called Myronic group is only the group of a Satyr and Maenad, a mere reminiscence, like many others, of the famous sculpture: cut.

Acquisitions of British and Berlin Museums 1886, with cuts of latter. Bibliography.—C. S.

Römische Mittheilungen. 1887: part 3. Rome.

1. Helbig: this year's excavations at Corneto. 2. Hartwig: marble head of Helios which has had bronze rays, found in Rhodes in 1857: and a similar head in terra-cotta; from a comparison with coins of Lampsaenus and Megiste, and with late types, this seems to represent the school of Lysippos and is probably from a group such as Lysippos made of Helios in his chariot; two plates, three cuts. 3. The same: Attic r.f. cups in Rome with names of artists and their favourites. 4. Dümmler: a class of black-figured vases with peculiar design and ornamentation, hitherto wrongly called Etruscan: and their bearing on early representations of Scythians in Greek art: two plates, two cuts.

5. Stettiner: the inferior weight of the Etruscan *as* is not due to the late adoption of the *as grave* into Etruria, but is a reduction from a primitive series previously existing there. 6. Lignana: Faliscan inscriptions. 7. Barnabei: an interesting inscription found on the Via Ostiense, recording a decree of July 25th, 227 A.D. in answer to a request of one Geminus Eutychetes to the Quinquennales that he might erect a small monument (*memoriola*) in the *horti olitorii*: with reference probably to a *collegium magnum* of slaves and freedmen of the imperial household. 8. Mau: the term 'pergula', used frequently to express the place where objects are exposed for sale, is explained in the buildings of Pompeii.—C. S.

Revue Archéologique. July—August. 1887. Paris.

1. Berger: the basalt sarcophagus of Tabnith, recently found by Hamdy Bey at Saïda, with transcription of the very important Phœnician inscription by Ernest Renan: Tabnith was the father of the Eshmunazar, whose sarcophagus was discovered in 1855. The form is anthropoid, and the inscriptions are in hieroglyphics and Phœnician characters. The date is probably about the beginning of the third century B.C.: two plates. 2. Vernaz: Notes on 'Excavations at Carthage, 1884—5': plate. 3. Vercoeur: the necropolis of Sfax and the custom of burial in jars: the jars are broken or sawn in two, the body, sometimes *nude*, inserted, and the parts of one or more jars are then rejoined; the whole is then laid horizontally, and covered with a roof of large tiles; the gable ends thus formed are also blocked with tiles: three cuts. 4. Bazin: the amphitheatre of Lugdunum; a letter preserved in Eusebius from the Christians in Lyons to their brethren in Asia, describes certain martyrdoms in the amphitheatre there, which seems to have been discovered by M. Lafon. 5. Deloche: signet rings of the Merovingian period: continued. 6. Homolle: the Iomileas mentioned in the Delian lists is the same as the Carthaginian ambassador honoured in an Athenian decree (Hicks' *Manual*, 142). 7. Prost: Christian sarcophagi of Gaul: continued. 8. Néroutsos-Bey: Greek inscriptions from Alexandria: continued.

Salomon Reinach's *Chronique d'Orient*; forty pages full of interesting news from all parts of the ancient world; we may note a long letter (p. 76), in which Mr. Stillman returns to the attack on Tiryus. Hamdy Bey brings (p. 118) important testimony to bear on the falsity of the so-called 'Asia Minor' terra-cottas. Letters from Néroutsos-Bey on a Græco-Byzantine inscription, and on four inscriptions recently found at Ramleh.

Reviews: G. Humbert, 'Essai sur les finances et la comptabilité publique chez les Romains.' Studniczka, 'Beiträge zur Geschichte der altgr. Tracht.' Pais, 'Straboniana.' Marquardt und Mommsen, 'Manuel des Antiquités Romaines': traduction, Vol I.—C. S.

Bullettino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale di Roma. 1887. Rome.

PART 9. (I.) Visconti describes an interesting marble relief, recently discovered in the Villa Ludovisi: it occupies the three faces of a rectangular framework, which may have served to protect some aperture. On the front is a female, only half seen, rising apparently out of water, assisted by an attendant on each side, who hold the ends of a veil which passes in front of the central figure. On one side-piece is a nude female with legs crossed, leaning back and playing on the

double flutes. On the other, a female, closely draped, sits holding a lamp, which she is about to place on a candelabrum beside her. Visconti thinks it may have reference to a *lustratio* in the lesser Eleusinia; and that it is an archaistic work of early Imperial times. It is to be placed in the museum of the Villa Ludovisi; two plates. (II.) Gatti notes recent discoveries bearing on topography and epigraphy, including three tombs of the oldest necropolis, containing vases of the so-called Latial bucchero, bronze fibulae, and bronze rings: and near the Via Genova, a quantity of bronze and other objects of the first century A.D. (III.) De Rossi and Gatti continue the publication of inscribed collars of slaves.—C. S.

American Journal of Archaeology, 1887, vol. iii. nos. 1, 2.

1. Waldstein: restates Bernoulli's opinion that the Louvre Venus Genetrix is a replica from the work of Arkesilaos: and Lenormant's attribution of the Esquiline Venus to the school of Pasiteles. Plate. 2. Fowler: Thrasymedes, who made the statue of Asklepios at Epidaurus, is probably as late as the end of the fourth century, and the Melian terra-cotta reliefs used by Brunn as evidence of an earlier date probably have no connection with the throne-reliefs of that statue. 4. Wheeler republishes and comments on the Attic decree concerning the 'Sanctuary of Kodros' ('*Ἐφημερίς*', 1884, p. 161). Two plates. 6. Frothingham: a proto-Ionic capitaal on an Oriental cylinder, and bird worship. Plate.

Reviews.—(i.) Numismatics: Coin Catalogues of British Museum; Garrucci, 'Le Monete dell'Italia antica'; Imhoof-Blumer's 'Porträtköpfe auf antiker Münzen'; Six 'De Gorgone'; Imhoof-Blumer and P. Gardner, 'Numismatic Commentary on Pausanias'; and nine Russian publications on the coinages of the Kimmerian Bosphoros; Friedländer and Weil, 'Repertorium zur antiker Numismatik'; Head, 'Historia Numorum'; Soutzo, 'Étalons pondéraux primitifs'; Cohen, 'Description des monnaies frappées sous l'empire Romain'; Boutowski, 'Dictionnaire Numismatique'; Schlumberger, 'Œuvres de A. de Longperier'; Lépaule, 'Edit de Maximin.'

Menant, 'The French expedition to Susiana.' Two plates. Letters from Tripoli, Olympia, Sidon.

Reviews.—(ii.) Petrie's 'Naukratis'; Reber's 'History of Mediaeval Art,' Translated by J. T. Clarke, Fenger 'Dorische Polychromie'; De Rossi's Introduction to vol. i. of the Catalogue of the Palatine MSS.; and his 'Basilica di S. Stefano Rotondo.'

Archæological News, Summary of Recent Discoveries and Investigations. Summaries of Periodicals.

Plate x. omitted from vol. ii. is here given.—C. S.

Musco Italiano di Antichità Classica, vol. ii. pt. 2. Florence.

1. Sabbadini: Latin codices possessed, discovered, and illustrated by Guarino Veronese. 2. Pistelli: On the MSS. of Iamblichus, and a new edition of the *Protreptikos*. 3. Tomassetti: Sylloge of 'Latial' inscriptions. 4. Piccolomini: The simulated madness of Solon, and the elegy *Σαλαμίς*. 5. Halbherr: The recent excavations at Gortyna; four plates. 6. Comparetti: Archaic inscriptions of Gortyna recently found in excavations near the Letheum. 7. The same: Inscriptions from various Cretan cities.

Revue Numismatique, 3rd. ser. vol. v. 3rd. trimestre, 1887. H. B. Earle Fox, 'The Athenian Obol and its divisions at the Macedonian epoch.—E. Babelon, 'A tetradrachm of Eretria.' A rare coin in the French Collection. M. Babelon reads on it the name of an engraver ΦΑ.—Th. Reinach, 'Essay on the numismatics of the kings of Bithynia.' The first instalment of an elaborate study of this series, accompanied by plates.—E. Lépaule, 'Mariniana and Saloninus.' It is suggested that Mariniana, who is known only from coins, was the first wife of Gallienus and the mother of the Marinianus whose name appears on a medallion of Gallienus. The date A. D. 258 usually assigned for the death of Saloninus is discussed, and A. D. 266 proposed as preferable.

Reviews. R. Mowat's 'Explication d'une marque monétaire du temps de Constantin,' by P. Charles Robert.

Zeitschrift für Numismatik. Berlin. vol. xv. part I. 1887. A. Von Sallet.—'Acquisitions of the Royal Coin-Cabinet from April 1, 1886 to April 1, 1887.—Of the 426 coins acquired, 159 are Greek and 24 Roman.—A. Löbbecke. 'Greek Coins from my Collection.' Part III.—W. Drexler. 'On some Coins published by Sabatier in the *Revue de la Numismatique belge*.' Corrects errors in Sabatier's descriptions.

Annuaire de la Société française de Numismatique. July—August, 1887. A. de Belfort, 'Roman Imperial Coins not described in Cohen's Work.' The descriptions of these new coins fill 20 pp. of the article.—A. Chaugarnier, 'The Drachms of the Pictavi.' Gives a list of coins which may be attributed to the Pictavi, chiefly from the evidence of the find-spots of the specimens.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Athenaeum.—17 Sept. contains a review of P. Gardner's Catalogue of Greek coins; Peloponnesus (excluding Corinth). 15 Oct. notices of R. Ellis' *Fables of Arionus*, and Haskins' *Lucan's Pharsalia* (the introduction by Mr. Heitland is very highly praised).

Academy.—1 Oct. letter from H. Nettleship, complaining of Reitzenstein's treatment of his essays on *Terentius Plautus*. 8 Oct. review by R. Ellis, of Hildebrandt's studies in Vergil's *Culex* (the author maintains that ninety-six verses are by Vergil, and that the remaining 318 are spurious additions). 15 Oct. E. Sibree holds that λᾶω (Hom. *Od.* 19, 229) = fremere. The Nos. from 17 Sept. to 15 Oct. contain a discussion by E. P. L. Brock, W. T. Watkin and others, on the age of walls of Chester, and a dozen inscriptions on tombstones are communicated by W. T. Watkin. In the 1 Oct. and following Nos. an inscription on a Roman patera found at South Shields is discussed by R. Blair and J. H. Abrahall.

The October No. of *Macmillan's Magazine* has an article on Homer the Botanist; and the *Fortnightly Review* an article by A. Lang on Byways of Greek Song.

Archiv für lateinische Lexicographie, iv. 2:—

(Pp. 169–188) *Genuswechsel der Diminutiva* (A. Weinhold). After considering the diminutive suffixes, generally in agreement with Osthoff, Weinhold discusses what he thinks 'diminutives falsely so called,' i.e. words in *-ulus*, *-ulum*, *-ulum*, &c. Then (p. 180) he divides the dim. with altered gender into (1) words preserving an older gender, (2) where the meaning changes markedly (3) where the sense demands a particular gender (*Corculus*, &c.), (4) examples from late Latin where no reason for the change of gender is visible. The paper has no index, and some details are treated scantily.—(pp. 189–196) *Das Pflanzenreich im Sprichwort* (A. Otto)—(p. 196) *Isid. Or.* 17. 3. 10 (Schwarz) read 'hexastichum.'—(pp. 197–222) *Die Verba frequentativa und intensiva* (E. Wölfflin). In six sections: (1) the frequentatives are formed from the perf. pass. part. or by analogy. In some cases one can trace old participles thus **vevus*, whence *vero* by the side of *recto* *vectus*. (2) Frequentative verbs are used in ante- and post-classical literature, avoided by Terence, Cicero, Caesar, and

Livy (except in first decade). (3) Frequentative and intensive verbs are the same. (4) and (5) Meaning of the suffix: *capture* = 'geschickt u. öfter greifen,' not 'greifen wollen.' (6) Frequentative verbs lost their special sense by 300 A.D. Two main causes were (a) use of freq. verbs to supply missing forms, and (b) use *metri gratia* in poets—(pp. 223–245) *Die Verba auf-illare* (A. Funck). Continued from p. 87. The chief verbs considered are *ocillo*, *sorbillo*, *sugillo*, *focillo*, *obstringillo*, *vacillo*. No conclusion is reached about *sugillo*.—(p. 246) *Expedire* (L. Havet)—(pp. 247–258) *Uls, trans, ultra* (Ph. Thielmann). First part of a lexicographical article—(p. 258) *Lausa* (Schöll). In *Truul.* 730 for MSS. *lausum* read *lausam* (*Archiv.* ii. 605: iii. 510)—(pp. 259–276) *Ueber die Latinität der 'Peregrinatio ad loca sancta'* (E. W.) The article is full of most interesting detail about the Latin of 400 A.D.—(pp. 277–287) Lexicographical articles on *Abhorreo*, *abhorresco*, *abhorride*, by H. Ploen—(pp. 288–315) Thirty-six lexicographical articles *abi*—to *abl*—, by E. W.—(p. 315) *Interemo, premo* (K. E. Georges).—(pp. 316–324) *Miscellen*: *Komposita auf -fer* and *-ger* (Stolz), *verba auf-izare*, &c. (Funck) *In privativum (haud impiiye)* by Vogel, &c.—(pp. 325–343) *Reviews*: p. 342 of Mowat's *Alphita*.

Neue Jahrbücher f. Philologie und Pädagogik, ed. Fleckeisen u. Masius, iii. and iv. parts (Leipzig, Teubner) contain the following articles:—(1) *Zur Odyssee*, by A. Scotland (continued), notes on φ and γ. (2) *Zu Theognis*, 1015, by J. Sitzler, chiefly on the transitive use of πῆλαι. (3) *Technologisches zu Soph. Aias*, 651, by R. Paehler, defending the suggestion βαῖνη for βαφῆ. (4) *Zur Kritik der Griech. Tragiker*, by H. Stadtmüller, proposing in Aesch. *Cho.* 515 either κοιμᾶσ' ἀρήκεστον πάθος or τέμνονσ' ἀνηκέστον ἄκος: Aesch. *Suppl.* 456 ἀκουστά· καὶ λέγοις ἄν: Aesch. *Cho.* 273 τοῦ πατρὸς μαιφύβρους: *Soph. Trach.* 528 ἐλευνὸν ἀμβλέπει: *Soph. Phil.* 258 γελῶσιν ἐγχαλόντες or γελᾶσ' ἄγαν χλόντες: *Soph. El.* 28 ἐν πρώτοις πρέπει: *Soph. O.C.* 1336 δκνοῦμεν, and in 861 δκνὸν λέγει: τοῦτ' αὐτὸ νῦν πεπράξεται: *Eur. Med.* 649 μοῖραν ἀμὲν ἐξανόσασα: *Eur. Iph. Aut.* 671 ἐατέον χρῆ τοῖα μὴ εἶδέναι κόρας and 418 εἰς τε τέρψην εἰ σφ' ἰδῶν. (5) *Zum Hom. Hermes hymnos* 234, by R. Peppmüller, rejecting the whole line. (6) *Zu Epicharmos*, by E. Hiller, a discussion of the saying αἷτα φύσις ἀνθρώπων, ἀσχοὶ πεφουσημένοι attributed to Ep. by Clemens Al. *Strom.* iv. 15, and other

writers. (7) *Der Idealstaat des Antisthenes*, by F. Susemihl, a discussion of the tenth volume of Antisthenes as described by Diog. Laert. vi. 18. (8) *Ein neuentdeckter Codex des Aristoteles*, by G. Konstantinides, describing very briefly a MS. of *περὶ οὐρανοῦ, περὶ γέν. καὶ φθορ.* and *περὶ ψυχῆς* lately discovered in Philippopolis. (9) *Skylla in der Aristot. Poetik und der Jüngere Dithyrambos*, by F. Susemihl, an answer to Gomperz's critique, which, with Susemihl's first article, is in the *Jahrb.* for 1886. (10) *Zu Diog. Laertios*, by F. Hultsch, three little criticisms on the life of Arkesilaos, in iv. 39-43. (11) On *ἐπτόμην* and *ἐπτάμην*, by K. P. Schulze, concluding that the former is the usual form in prose, but the latter is frequent in Plato. (12) On Delbrück's *Die Perserkriege und die Burgunderkriege* (Berlin, 1887), a notice by L. Reinhardt, giving the chief points without criticism. (13) *Zum Hom. Hermes hymnos*, by A. Ludwig, reading 224 *ἐλπομαι εἶναι* and proposing, 225, *οὐτις*, with some other MSS. (14) *Ad Plutarchi de Proverbiis Alexandrinorum Libellum nuper repertum*, by O. Crusius, an account of emendations admitted by the writer in his recent edition (Leipzig, Teubner). (15) *Zu Cic. Verr.* iv. 128, by H. Kothe, proposing for *parinum caput* either *pari num* [*inis contemplatione*] *caput* or *pari vi num* (the subsequent *num* being merely conjectural). (16) *Emendationes Vergilianae*, by E. Baehrens, a long series of conjectures to *Æn.* iii. of which we may cite 33 *liquitur* (cf. for the quantity *Lucr.* iv. 1259), 411 *parcescent*, 448 *ventos*, 454 *et tua cursus*, 484 *ne cedat honore*, 605 *frustus* (cf. *Naevius.* i. p. 525), 670 *adirectare*, 674 *Sicaniae*, 683 *sequendis*. (17) *Zu Cic. de Orat.* ii. 240, by O. Harnecker, explaining the letters LLLMM as an electioneering placard, *Legē Lactus Lubens Merito Memmium*. (18) *Zu Juvenalis Satiren*, by A. Weidner, another long series of conjectures, of which only a few can conveniently be cited, as X. 295 *osque suum*, X. 191 *et aniles* (previously suggested by N. Heinsius), viii. 241 *quantum unda Leucade*, v. 141 *sua nunc Mycale*, iii. 104 *ad omnia for et omni* (cf. *Lucr.* i. 1106, acc. to Lachmann) xii. 23 *qualia*.

Philologus, vol. xlii, part 2 contains:—

I. Abhandlungen.

9. P. W. Forchhammer, *Mythologie eine wissenschaft.* "A myth represents by a series of double entendres (*γλῶτται*, *διπλὰ ὀνόματα*, *μεταφοραί*, ref. to Plato and Arist.) a set of natural phenomena as volitions of the supernatural." Treatment exemplified. —10. R. Hildebrandt, *Ἀθήνη Γλαυκῶπις*. "The goddess of the clear-grey sea, from *γλαυκ* still-bright rather than *sparkling* and *ωπ-* water." Other derivatives of each √.—11. R. Unger, *Bemerkungen zu Hygini Fabulae*. Chiefly critical.—12. Richardus Foerster, *De Adamantii Physiognomonicis recensendis*. —13. E. Schweder, *Ueber die gemeinsame quelle der geographischen darstellungen des Mela und des Plinius*. "Each, as well as Strabo, had access to an official *χωρογραφία*, companion to the famous map." —14. G. F. Unger, *Die römischen kalenderdata aus 218—15 v. Ch.* Against the system and the conclusions of Matzat (*Römische Chronologie* I, II, and *Zeittafeln*).

II. Jahresberichte.

47. H. F. Müller, *Plotinos* (continued from xxxix. 1). The fresh publications on the author enumerated and reviewed.

III. Miscellen.

A. *Mittheilungen aus handschriften.* 7. Xaver Kreuttnr, *Handschriftliches zu dem lexikon des Ammonius*. On MS no. 2652 Paris.

B. *Zur erklärang und Kritik der schriftsteller.*

1. Fr. Susemihl, *Zu Platons Theaetelos*, (155 B) omits *μήτε αὐξηθέντα... ἐνιαυτῷ*. (182 B) reads *ἀμφοτέρων ἀμφοτέρα*. (192 A—D) inserts *καὶ ὁ οἶδε καὶ αἰσθάνεται*, ὁ μὴ οἶδε μὴδ' αἰσθάνεται in B, after *κατὰ ταῦτά*, ὁ αἰσθάνεται, and *καὶ ὁ μὴ οἶδε μὴδ' αἰσθάνεται*, ὁ οἶδε καὶ αἰσθάνεται in C, after ὁ μὴ αἰσθάνεται. (195 A) with H. Schmidt, strikes out *ἢ ἐπινοῶσιν* and *καὶ παρανοοῦσι*.—9. L. Tachau, *Zu Senecas tragödien*. 1. *Here. Oct.* 134—172 is not by Seneca but a cento.—10. M. Erdmann, *Zu Cornelius Nepos*. Defending him as an author for schoolboys, with cautions for his use.—21. M. Petschenig, *Zu Seneca de vita beata*. 12. 5. 'adlubescenciae' for 'adulesce.' 13. 2. 'et iam induit' for 'set iam inde.' C. *Auszüge aus Schriften*, &c.

Notes:—Th. Stangl, *Zu Ciceros Briefen*. Read 'Haec nimirum...' for 'Haec mihi...' (*ad Brut.* i 17, 4).—A. Eussner, *Zu Fulgentius*, xiv 1. 23 (Reifferssch.): 'Augustis' for 'angustiis.'—Rob. Petersen, *Zu L. Seneca (De Clem.* i 5.5.): 'infractam' for 'infra terram.'—M. Petschenig, *Zu Seneca dem philosophen (De provid.* 4. 3.): 'conatum' for 'una vim'; (*De const. sap.* 6. 3.) 'sed sic procedit...quasi dicat' (4-4) 'et se quoque.' (8. 3.) 'domini minitanti' (18. 1.) 'ferebatur [in] omnis.'

Rheinisches Museum, vol. xlii. part 3, contains:—

E. Hiller, *Beiträge zur griechischen Litteraturgeschichte*, V. *Homer als Collectivname*. 'That Homer was ever held by common opinion in antiquity to be the author of the epic cycle is erroneous, and due to the deceptions of rhapsodists, &c. with misapprehension of the loci.'—A. Otto, *Zur Kritik von Staius Silvae*. Notes and emendations in Bk. i.—P. Natorp, *Nochmals Diogenes und Leukippos*. Replying to Diels' attack xlii 1.—O. Crusius, *Ueber die Sprichwörterammlung des Maximus Planudes*. On the MSS, history, and editions of the work, with the most interesting passages quoted and illustrated.—G. Thouret, *Die Chronologie von 218—17 v. Chr.* Against the date fixed for Trebia by Matzat in the *Zeittafeln*.—J. Ilberg, *Zur Ueberlieferung des Hippokratischen Corpus*. Classifying the MSS.—C. Wachsmuth, *Zur Topographie von Alexandria*. Deductions from a passage quoted from a monk by Theodorus, Bishop of Paphos.—*Herodicea*, scripsit J. Schönmann 'Ar. Ran. 1028. Read *Μαρδονίου* for *Δαρείου*: reference to second edition of *Persae*, acted at Syracuse; see *Scholia*.'

Miscellen:—

Coniectanea, scripsit F. B.—I. Defends his reading 'suum' in *Juv.* x 294. II. Punctuates 'ille sui, palpo quem' in *Pers.* v 175, and refers the Floralia mentioned, not to the Roman festival but cf. C.I.L. ix 3947. III. *Lucil. fr.* 103 *Bähr*. Reads 'si dent for 'student'; *Id. fr.* 585 'arguta manu' for 'argutimini.' IV. *Julius Romanus ap. Charis.* p. 145, 29. Reads 'torces' for 'tores,' and for Pomponianus cf. C.I.L. viii. 2391.—A. Ludwig, *Zur Aeschylus Eumeniden*, l. 76: read 'κέν...βεβῶς ἀμείψης'.—E. Rohde, *Die Zeit des Pittacus*: a comment on Susemihl's paper, xlii. p. 141.—R. Schöll, *Inscript von Knidos*, 'Newton, *Disc. Halicarn.*, &c. I. pl. xcii. No. 40; II. p. 755: read *ἀθανάτοις θυσέντα | δαμιούργος* 'Ἀρποκρᾶς | ἰδρύσατο βωμόν.'—E. Hoffman; *Epeur (Gerhard Etr. Spiegel*, III Pl. 181; IV 335): derives from 'Ἐπειος of Elis.—K. Zangemeister, *Zu Velleius*, I. (i 17, 35) 'procedentis in unum saeculum' II. (ii 109, 51): for 'Corpus suum custodientium' read 'corona saltuum custoditum.'—E. Wölfflin, *Zu Suetonis Pratum*.—J. Cholodniak, *Prosepnais oder Prosepnai?* 'On the Speculum Cosanum, the older reading Prosepnai is the true one' (from actual inspection).—M. Ihne, *Neue Inschriften*

aus Köln und Mainz—I. A votive tablet to the Quadriviae; II. A tomb inser. (fragmentary); III. A dedication (also fragmentary).

Philologische Rundschau, Bremen, 1887:—

No. 1 (8 Jan.)—W. Christ, *Platonische Studien*, Abhandlungen der Königl. bayer. Akad. i. kl. xvii. Bd. ii. Abt. (Nusser): an interesting and valuable contribution towards determining the chronology and mutual relations of the dialogues.—Heraeus, *Quaestiones criticae et palaeographicae de cod. Livianis* (Lutembacher): deserves to be extended into a regular and much-needed treatise on Latin palaeography.—Riemann, *Études sur la langue de Tite Live* (Schmalz): one of the most valuable monographs on Latin style and syntax.

No. 3 (5 Feb.)—Fick, *Die Homerische Ilias in der ursprünglichen Sprach-form* (Sittl). The attempt to Aeolize Homer is open to objections: (1) the late date of the Aeolic colonies; (2) the impossibility of removing all non-aeolic forms; (3) the marked difference between the laws of the Homeric and Aeolic digamma.—Brugmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen* (Stolz): sums up in a clear and attractive form the results arrived at in Comparative Grammar since the appearance of the fourth edition of Schleicher's work in 1876.

No. 4 (19 Feb.)—Schubert, *Sophoclis Trachiniae* (Müller): the editor gives a new collation of the Laurentian, and of Paris A, which he regards as the chief of an independent family; the work shows a thorough acquaintance with Sophoclean literature.—Baunach, *Studien auf dem gebiete des griechischen und der arischen Sprachen* (Stolz): a discussion of the Gortynian inscription, followed by a publication of various inscriptions chiefly from the Asclepieion at Epidaurus.

No. 5 (5 March)—Pfitzner, *Taciti Annales*, xi-xvi. (Wolff): the editor's chief endeavour has been to follow the line of thought; his grammatical, historical and antiquarian notes are perhaps even too short; in his criticism of the text he is thoroughly conservative.—Friedländer, *Martialis Epigrammata* (Zingerle): a new collation of the MSS. has done much to further the criticism of the text, while the explanatory notes are masterly.—Dahl, *Zur Handschriftenkunde des ciceronischen Cato Maior* (Degenhart): a fuller account of Leiden V, published by Gemoll, and of Paris P, with readings from thirty-eight other MSS. at Paris, and eight at Leiden.—Zacher, *Zur griechischer Nominal-composition*, *Breslauer philologische Abhandlungen*, i. Band, i. Hft 1886 (Stolz): a valuable contribution.

No. 6 (19 March)—Meister, *Quintiliani Institutio Oratoria*, vol. i. (Kiderlin): a great advance on previous editions.—Hermann von der Pforten, *Zur Geschichte der griechischer Denominativen* (Stolz): fills a gap.—Engelbrecht, *über die Sprache des Claudianus Mamertus* (Mohr): points out the influence of Apuleius or Claudianus Mamertus and other Gallic writers of the fifth century.

No. 7 (2 April)—Ritterling, *de legione x. gemina* (Pfitzner): the success of this first work should lead the writer to attempt a general history of the legions.—Menger, *Einführung in die antike Kunst*, second edition (Neuling): improved by the addition of new matter and photographs, but lessened in value as a school book by the introduction of Asiatic art, and a number of minute details.

No. 8 (16 April)—Owen, *Ovid, Tristia*, Book i. (Gustafsson): the recension of the text based on an independent collation of the MSS. is carried out on sound and conservative principles; the introduction

gives a satisfactory account of the life and literary history of the poet.—Menrad, *de contractionis et synizescos usu Homérico* (Kammer): a work of much pains and learning; the author tries to show that in the original poem contraction was used only (1) in the last foot, (2) in the chief caesura, (3) where several short vowels occur close together.—Zvetaieff, *Inscriptiones Italiae inferioris* (Pauli): the inscriptions are not always accurately reproduced, and the interpretations are often one-sided.—Wattenbach, *Anleitung zur lateinischer palaeographie*, fourth edition (Ruess): considerably enlarged to embrace the results of palaeographical studies in the last ten years.

No. 9 (30 April)—Rettig, *Xenophontis Symposium* (Bullinger): a restoration of the work to its proper place.—Meister, *Quintiliani Institutio Oratoria*, vol. ii. (Kiderlin): possesses the same merits as vol. i. criticized in vi.—Simon, *on the Gortynian Inscription* (Rettig): the work is not without value in spite of printers' and other errors.—Johansson, *de derivatis verbis contractis linguae graecae* (Stolz): a useful contribution.

Zeitschrift für das Gymnasialwesen—The July-August number contains nothing of interest for readers of this Review, unless it be a most elaborate criticism of the 30th edition of Ellendt's School Latin Grammar, revised by Seyffert. In the September number there is a long review of a book by Knoke upon Germanicus's campaigns in Germany. Knoke claims to have settled all the localities. But his critic has little difficulty in convicting him of blunders and of a want of logic almost equal to the presumption with which he asserts his infallibility. The chief interest in the criticism seems to be a personal one.

Revue Critique, 1887.—Besides reviews each part gives a chronicle, summaries of periodicals, and proceedings of the Acad. des Inscriptions and the Soc. Nat. des Antiquités de France. (3 Jan.) Koestlin's ed. of 'Schwegler's Greek Philosophy'; Selections from 'Plato,' by Purves and Jowett; Campbell's 'Theaetetus'; C. Waddington, 'On the authenticity of the Platonic writings'; Hesselmeier, 'On the origin of the city of Pergamos'; H. Paul, 'Principles of Linguistic.' (10 Jan.) 'Silvestre de Sacy,' by M. H. Derembourg. (17 Jan.) 'Éléments de Gram. Grecque,' by Roersch and Thomas; Horace 'Ars Poetica,' with notes by M. Albert. (24 Jan.) Dionysii Thracis 'Ars Grammatica,' by Uhlig; 'Les Sarcophages Chrétiens de la Gaule,' by Le Blanc; P. Janet, 'Histoire de la Science Politique.' (7 Feb.) 'Brugmann's Comparative Grammar,' vol. i.; Löwy 'Inschriften griech. Bildhauer.' (14 Feb.) Duruy, 'Histoire des Grecs,' vol. i.; Wex, 'Métrologie grecque et romaine,' tr. by P. Monet. (21 Feb.) Holder's 'Herodotus,' vol. i.; Poirer, 'Essai sur l'éloquence judiciaire à Rome'; De Rossi, 'Il monastero di S. Erasmo.' (28 Feb.) Collignon, 'Phidias'; Robert Ellis, 'Sources of the Etruscan and Basque languages'; Fierville, 'Une grammaire latine inédite du treizième siècle.' (14 March) Barclay Head, 'Historia Numorum'; Henzen, 'Les opérations militaires de J. César étudiées sur le terrain'; Vernes, 'Une nouvelle hypothèse sur la composition de l'origine de Deutéronome.' (21 March) Egger, 'Histoire de la critique chez les grecs,' ed. 2; De Ruggiero, 'Dizionario epigraphico di Antichità romane.' (28 March) Loeschke, 'Boreas u. Oreithyia am Kypseloskasten.' (4 April) Engel, 'die Aussprache des Griechischen'; Wehrlich, 'Speculum quod fertur S. Augustini'; Vernes, 'Histoire des religions.' (11 April) Bazin, 'L'Aphrodite Marseillaise du Musée de Lyons'; Darmesteter, 'La vie des Mots';

Wheeler, 'Der griechische Nominal-accent.' (18 Apr.) Vischer, 'L'Apocalypse de Saint Jean; Droysen, 'Hist. de l'Hellénisme,' tr. by Bouché-Leclercq; Omont, 'Catalogue des MSS. grecs des bibliothèques de Suisse.' (25 April) Rouire, 'La découverte du bassin hydrographique de la Tunisie centrale, etc.'; Hauvette, 'Les Stratèges Athéniens'; Aubé, 'L'Église et l'État dans la seconde moitié du troisième siècle.' (2 May) Buchholz, 'Vindiciae Carminum Homerorum,' vol. i.; Upcott, 'Introduction to Greek Sculpture'; E. Mérimée, 'De antiquis aquarum religionibus in Gallia Meridionali'; 'Gazette Archéologique,' 1886; L. G. Pelissier, 'Les amis d'Holstenius,' vol. ii.: Notice of Prize offered by the University of Göttingen for the best edition of the remains of the Greek Stoic philosophers, to be sent in by Aug. 31, 1889. (9 May) Hauvette, 'De archonte rege'; Denis, 'La comédie grecque'; De Colleville, 'Hist. abrégée des Empereurs grecs et romains'; P. Allard, 'Hist. des persécutions pendant la première moitié du troisième siècle.' (16 May) Babelon, 'Description historique des monnaies de la République romaine'; Omont, 'Inventaire des manuscrits grecs' (in France, the British Museum, Belgium, Switzerland); 'Inscription funéraire de Qalonie'; 'Πήγασος et Πήγνυμι'; 'Apollon Agyieus.' (23 May) Oberziner, 'Le culte du soleil chez les anciens Égyptiens'; Miliarakis, 'Géographie politique de l'Argolide et de la Corinthe' (in Greek). (30 May) Schulz, 'Quibus ex fontibus fluxerint Agidis, Cleomenis, Arati vitae Plutarchae'; Mommsen and Marquardt, 'Manuel des Antiquités romaines,' tr. by Humbert; Mommsen, 'Droit public romain,' by Girard; Omont, 'Catalogue des MSS. grecs' (in Holland). (6 June) A. Croiset, 'Thucydides i. ii. avec un commentaire critique et explicatif.' (13 June) Schwartz, 'Scholia in Euripidem,' vol. i.; Pearson and Strong, 'Satires of Juvenal'; 'La suppression des nasales dans l'écriture cypriote.' (20 June) Regnier, 'De la latinité des sermons de S. Augustine.' (27 June) Reinach, 'Essai dans la numismatique des rois de Cappadoce.' (4 July) Homolle, 'De antiquissimis Dianae simulacris Deliacis, Les archives de l'intendance sacrée à Délos'; Renier, 'Inscriptions romaines de l'Algérie'; Weizsäcker, 'Das apostolische Zeitalter der christlichen kirche.' (11 July) Lange, 'Kleine Schriften,' vol. i. (18 July) Petschenig,

'Corippus.' (25 July) Beloch, 'Der Bevölkerung der griechisch-römischen Welt.' (1 Aug.) Holden, 'Cyropaedia of Xenophon,' i. ii.

Theol. Tijdschrift, xxi. 4. July, 1887—Dr. W. C. van Manen on Marcion's text of the Epistle to the Galatians. In this article the history of the question is given at some length, and reasons alleged for distrusting the testimony of the Fathers who accuse Marcion of altering the place and text of this epistle; the latter accusation shown to be clearly untrue in ii. 5, where οὐδέ must have been omitted by the Catholics, not inserted by Marcion.—Dr. J. van Leeuwen, criticises H. Was's study on Plato's *Symposium* in an article called *Een booze demon*, which the Platonic Eros is according to Was, but not according to van Leeuwen: "it is a sacrilege to attach to the last words of the speech of Socrates even 'een zweem van gemeenheid.'"—Dr. J. Balyon reviews Heinrici's commentary on 2 Cor. "He exhibits great philological as well as theological knowledge; is one of the best modern guides to the interpretation of Paul's epistles; but fails in critical method, and errs in rejecting all conjectural emendation."—xxi. 5. (Sept. 1887)—Continuation of van Manen's articles on Marcion's text of the Epistle to the Galatians. The author collects all the cases in which Marcion is accused of having altered the text, and endeavours to show that in all these Marcion's was the original text; this will involve the omission of many verses (e.g. iii. 5-10, 15-25), and the alteration of many others (e.g. v. 9 ζυμοὶ τοῖς δολοῖ). The evidence is mainly drawn from the requirements of the context. It is further urged that Marcion can have had no reason for mutilating this epistle, since before his time it was not used as an authoritative document. But if Marcion's text of the epistle was original, then the present form must be a 'Bearbeitung' by a Christian who regretted that the original epistle appeared in many respects to put the 'heretics' in the right, and must have been prior to Irenaeus. In a third article van Manen endeavours to discover other cases of 'Bearbeitung' in this epistle, in which the reading of Marcion is not recorded; and in a fourth gives in Greek what was probably the original text of the epistle.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

BOOKS PUBLISHED IN ENGLAND.

Æschylus. Eumenides. With Introduction and Notes, by A. Sidgwick. 2 vols. 16mo. 74. 66 pp. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 3s.
Cæsar. Helvetian War. Adapted for the use of Beginners, by W. Welch, M.A., and C. G. Duffield, M.A. With Notes, Exercises, and Vocabularies. 18mo. xii. 94 pp. London. Macmillan. 1s. 6d.
Cicero. In Q. Cæcilium Divinatio and in C. Verrem, Actio Prima, edited, with Introduction and Notes, by John R. King. 12mo. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1s. 6d.
Homer. Odyssey. Book I. With Introduction, Notes, and Table of Homeric Poems, by W. W. Merry. 12mo. 44 pp. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1s. 6d.
King (C. W.). The Gnostics and their Remains. Second Edition. Large 8vo. xxiii. 466 pp. 19 Woodcuts in text, 14 full-page plates. Bibliographical Appendix, by Joseph Jacobs, B.A., and full Indices. London. David Nutt. £1 1s.

Tacitus Annals: Book I., edited with Introduction and Notes, for use of Schools and Junior Students, by H. Furneaux. 12mo. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 2s.
Terence. Phormio. With Notes and Introductions, intended for the Higher Forms of Public Schools, by Rev. A. Sloman. 12mo. 176 pp. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 3s.
Testament, the Old, in Greek, according to the Septuagint. Edited, for the Syndics of the University Press, by H. B. Swete, D.D. Vol. I. Genesis—IV. Kings. Crown 8vo. xxviii. 829 pp. Cambridge, University Press. 7s. 6d.
Virgil. Æneid IX., edited, with Introduction and Notes, by A. E. Haigh. 12mo. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1s. 6d.
Xenophon. Cyropaedia. Books III., IV., V., with Notes, by Rev. Hubert A. Holden. 12mo. 230 pp. Cambridge Warehouse. 5s.

BOOKS PUBLISHED ON THE CONTINENT.

- Aristotelis* quae feruntur Oeconomica. Rec. Frz. Susemihl. 12mo. xxx. 94 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 1 Mk. 50.
- Bojesen-Hoffa*. Kurzgefasstes Handbuch der griechischen Antiquitäten. 2. Aufl. von E. Szanto. 8vo. x. 215 pp. Wien. Gerold. 4 Mk.
- Bürger* (K.) De Lucio Patrensi sive de ratione inter Asinum q. f. Lucianum Apuleique metamorphoses intercedente. 8vo. 59 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk. 60.
- Busson* (A.) Lykurgos und die grosse Rhetra. 8vo. 29 pp. Innsbruck. Wagner. 80 Pf.
- Cartault* (A.) Sur l'authenticité des groupes en terre-cuite d'Asie Mineure. 4to. 30 pp. 7 plates. Mâcon.
- Cicero*. De oratore liber I. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von Remig Stölzle. Band 1. Ausg. A. Kommentar unter dem Text. 8vo. vi. 119 pp. Gotha. F. A. Perthes. 1 Mk. 50. Ausg. B. Text und Kommentar getrennt in 2 Heften. iv. 55 and 66 p. 1 Mk. 50.
- Laelius de Amicitia. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von C. Meissner. 8vo. iii. 70 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 60 Pf.
- Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca edita consilio et auctoritate academiae litterarum regiae borussicae. Vol. IV., pars. I., et vol. XVI. Berlin. G. Reimer. 29 Mk.
- IV., 1. Porphyrii isagoge et in Aristotelis categorias commentarium ed. Adf. Busse. lvi. 181 pp. 9 Mk.
- XVI. Joannis Philoponi in Aristotelis physicorum tres libros priores commentaria ed. Hieron. Vitelli. xx., 495 pp. 20 Mk.
- Delbrück* (H.) Die Perserkriege und die Burgunderkriege. Zwei kombinierte kriegsgeschichtliche Studien, nebst einem Anhang über die römische Manipular Taktik. 8vo. (viii. 314 pp.). Berlin. Walther and Apolant. 6 Mk.
- Engelbrecht* (A.) Hephæstion von Theben und sein astrologisches Compendium. 8vo. (102 pp.) Wien. Konegen. 2 Mk.
- Hertmann* (I. I.) Analecta Xenophontea. 8vo. 405 pp. Lugd. Bat. Van Doesburgh.
- Herodotus*. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von I. Sitzler. Buch VIII. Ausg. A. Kommentar unterm Text. 8vo. iv. 108 pp. Gotha. F. A. Perthes. 1 Mk. 30. Ausg. B. Text und Kommentar getrennt in 2 Hften. (iv. 48 und 59 pp.) 1 Mk. 30. (VII. and VIII. 3 Mk. 30).
- Homer*. Odyssee. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von F. Weck. Heft. 4. Ausg. A. Kommentar unterm Text. 8vo. iv. 108 pp. Gotha. F. A. Perthes. 1 Mk. 20. Ausg. B. Text und Kommentar getrennt in 2 Heften. (pp. 129-174 und 119-168). 1 Mk. 20. (1-4. 4 Mk. 20).
- Keller* (O.) Thiere des classischen Alterthums in culturgeschichtlicher Beziehung. Mit 56 Abbildungen. 8vo. ix. 488 pp. Innsbruck. Wagner. 10 Mk. 80.
- Klussmann* (M.) Curarum Tertullianearum particulae III. 8vo. 80 pp. Gotha. F. A. Perthes. 1 Mk.
- Maréchal* (E.) Histoire de la civilisation ancienne: Orient, Grèce, Rome. 12mo. 102 pp. 83 cuts and maps. Paris. Delagrave. 5 frs.
- Nageotte* (E.) Précis de la littérature latine depuis les origines jusqu'au 6^e siècle de notre ère. 12mo. ii., 507 pp. Cuts. Paris. Garnier.
- Nissen* (H.) Griechische und römische Mythologie. 8vo. 45 pp. Nördlingen. Beck. 1 Mk.
- Orationes ex Sallusti, Livi, Curti, Taciti libris selectae. In usum gymnasiarum ed. P. Vogel. 8vo. iv. 205 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 2 Mk. 40.
- Plato*. Euthyphro. In scholarum usum denuo ed. Mart. Schanz. 8vo. 24 pp. Leipzig. B. Tauchnitz. 40 Pf.
- Sammlung ausgewählter Dialoge mit deutschen Kommentar, veranstaltet von Prof. M. Schanz. Band 1. Euthyphro. 8vo. B. Tauchnitz. 69 pp. 75 Pf.
- Poetae Christiani Minores. Pars I.: *Paulini Petricordiae* carmina rec. M. Petschenig; *Orientii* carmina rec. R. Ellis; *Paulini Pellaei* Eucharisticos rec. G. Brandes; *Claudii Marii Victoris Alethia* et *Probae* cento rec. C. Schenkl. 8vo. 640 pp. Vienna. Tempsky. 16 Mk. 40.
- Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. Vol. XVI.
- Reisig*. Vorlesungen über lateinische Sprachwissenschaft. Mit den Anmerkungen von Prof. F. Hause. Neu bearbeitet von I. H. Schmalz und Dr. Landgraf. 12mo. Vol. III. 12. 2 Mk. Vol. III. eplt. viii. 893 pp. Berlin. Calvary and Co. 18 Mk.
- Schnatter*. J. Éléments de la langue grecque. 4. cours. Éléments de syntaxe grecque. 2. éd. 12mo. iv. 52 pp. Berlin. Herbig. 75 Pf.
- Sophocles*. Tragödien erklärt von C. Schmelzer. Bd. 6. Philoctet. 8vo. 150 pp. Berlin. Habel. 1 Mk. 80. (1-6. 11 Mk. 40).
- Swoboda* (R.) De Demosthenis quae feruntur prooemiis. 8vo. vi. 103 pp., with one plate. Wien. Konegen. 3 Mk.
- Tacitus*. Annalen. Schulausg. von A. Draeger. Bd. 1. Buch I-IV. 5 Aufl. 8vo. vi. 298 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 2 Mk. 40.
- Teuffel* (W. S.) Lateinische Stilübungen. Aus dem Nachlasse hrsg. von S. Teuffel. 8vo. vii. 139 pp. Freiburg. Mohr. 3 Mk. 60.

The Classical Review

DECEMBER 1887.

M. Annaei Lucani Pharsalia. Edited with English notes, by C. E. HASKINS, M.A., Fellow and Classical Lecturer of St. John's College, Cambridge. With an Introduction by W. E. HEITLAND, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College, Cambridge. Bell and Sons. 1887. 14s.

NOTHING has for some time past been more loudly demanded in learned and literary circles than a good edition of Lucan. In spite of the glaring faults which disfigure the poet's style, his hollow rhetoric hiding deep ignorance of men and things, his gross violations of good taste, his want of all eye for proportion, his inability to make an interesting narrative or to draw a really consistent character, Lucan will always be read, and though a youthful poet and with all the faults of youth, will probably be read by grown men rather than by the young. It is not merely the interest which attaches to his brilliant career and tragic end, not merely the historical importance of the epoch to which he belongs and in the events of which he was so much concerned, that made his writings classical in the first century, and will always keep them so. There is more than this: Lucan was a real poet. Only a poet could have written, for instance, *saevumque arte complexa dolorem Perfruitur lacrimis et amat pro coniuge luctum*. He had the native intuitions of the poetical genius—a love of nature (witness his similes), a soaring spirit attracted by lofty speculations, a mastery of language and a style all his own. Hence the living interest which carries us on through his tortuous and provoking diction, and sustains us over the fatiguing tracts of his dreary rhetoric.

Scholars who know Mr. Heitland's edition of the *Pro Rabirio* will expect care and ability in whatever he writes, and his introduction to Lucan will not disappoint them. It is a solid piece of historical and critical

work. The points taken into consideration are (A) the ancient authorities for the life of Lucan; (B) the life of Lucan; (C) a general view of the *Pharsalia*; (D) the matter of the *Pharsalia*; (E) the hero of the *Pharsalia*; (F) the manner of the *Pharsalia*; (G) the relation of Lucan to other writers, especially Vergil; and Juvenal's relation to Lucan. Each of these chapters contains a number of sub-sections, which in a short review there is not space to enumerate.

The introduction deserves careful study not only from readers of Lucan but from all Latin scholars. The ablest and most interesting chapter is, I think, the fifth (E), 'Who is the hero of the *Pharsalia*?' Even the most 'general' reader will be delighted with the merciless analysis by which Mr. Heitland demonstrates that Caesar is the real, Pompeius only the nominal hero of the poem, and that Lucan is forced by the facts of the case to pay an unwilling homage to historical truth. The literary criticism of the following chapter (F) suffers somewhat from its rigidly scientific form, but it is none the less sound and refined. The discussion on Lucan's syntax and language will be found valuable, though it would be improved by being more fully worked out. To the list—very carefully drawn up—of Lucan's imitations of Vergil (G, p. cviii. foll.) the following may be added: I. 8. *quis furor, O cives, quae tanta insania ferri?* A. 7, 461. *Saevit amor ferri, et scelerata insania belli*. I. 60. *Tum genus humanum positis sibi consulat armis*; A. 1, 291. *aspera tum positis mitescent saecula bellis*. 187. *Clara per obscuram voltu maestissima noctem*, &c. A. 2, 270. *In somnis ecce ante oculos maestissimus Hector*, &c. 206. *Aestiferae Libyes viso leo comminus hoste Subsedit dubius totam dum colligit iram*. A. 12, 4. *Poenorum qualis in arvis.....Tum demum movet arma leo*. 530. *Fulgura fallaci micuerunt crebra sereno*. A. 5, 851. *Deceptus*

fraude sereni. 687. *Tristis Erinyes* = A. 2, 337. II. 32. *Votisque vocari Adsuetas*..... aures. G. 1, 42. *rotis iam nunc adsuesce vocari.* 236. *Nocte sopora.* A. 6, 390. *somni noctisque soporae.* 287. *Sed quo fata trahunt virtus secura sequetur.* A. 5, 709. *nate dea, quo fata trahunt retrahuntque sequamur.* 407. *Hadriacas qui verberat Aufidus undas.* A. 11, 405. *amnis et Hadriacas retro fugit Aufidus undas.* III. 68. *Ubere vix glaebae superat.* A. 1, 531. *potens armis atque ubere glaebae.* 98. *Ignibus atris.* A. 4, 384. *sequar atris ignibus.* 373. *moenia clausa.* A. 10, 22. *non clausa tegunt iam moenia Teucros.* 395. *Procumbunt nemora et spoliuntur robore silvae.* 440. *Procumbunt orni, nodosa impellitur ilex.* A. 6, 180. *procumbunt piceae, sonat icta securibus ilex, &c.* 418. *Saepe cavas motu terrae mugire cavernas.* A. 2, 53. *insonuere cavae sonitumque dedere cavernae.* 443. *Posuere comas.* A. 12, 209. *posuitque comas et brachia ferro.* 470. *Rupes, quam vertice montis Abscidit impulsu ventorum adiuta vetustas.* A. 12. 686. *annis solvit (saxum) sublapsa vetustas.* 500. *Letifer arcus* = A. 10, 169. 542. *Caerula verrunt* = A. 3, 208. 607. *Causam lacrimis.* A. 3, 305. *geminas, causam lacrimis, sacraverat aras.* 644. *At tumidus qua pulmo iacet.* A. 10, 387. *tumido in pulmone.* IV. 96. *Exiguam Cererem* = A. 7, 113. 143. *Postquam omnia fatis Caesaris ire videt.* A. 7, 592. *et saevae nutu Iunonis eunt res.* 427. *Tum freta servantur, dum se declivibus undis Aestus agat, refluxoque mari nudentur harenae.* A. 10. 288. *multi servare recursus Languentis pelagi.* 796. *Non tulit adflictis animam producere rebus.* A. 2, 637. *abnegat excisa vitam producere Troia.* 802. *Et gener atque socer bello concurrere iussi.* A. 7, 317. *hac gener atque socer coeant mercede suorum.* V. 39. *Libyae squalentibus arvis.* G. 1, 507. *squalent abductis arva colonis.* 46. *Consulite in medium* = A. 11, 335. 408. *Invenit et pavidus hiberno sidere classes.* A. 4, 309. *quin etiam hiberno moliris sidere classem.* 505. *Parta quies miseris.* A. 7, 598. *nam mihi parta quies.* 535. *Inopem durisse senectam.* A. 10, 192. *Cancntem molli pluma durisse senectam.* 799. *Labitur infelix* = G. 3, 498. VI. 174. *Nunc sude, nunc duro contraria pectora conto Detrudit muris.* A. 9, 510. *duris detrudere contis.* 228. *Tegens alta suppressum mente dolorem.* A. 1, 209. *premit altum corde dolorem.* 274. *Cumulumque furemtem Undarum.* A. 1, 105. *insequitur cumulo prae-ruptus aquae mons.* 800. *Pallentes aperit sedes.* A. 8, 244. *infernas reseret sedes et regna recludat Pallida.* VIII. 450. *Iura fidemque* = A. 2, 541. IX. 32. *Mille carinis* =

A. 2, 198. 73. *Luce maligna* = A. 6, 270. 471. *Galeas et scuta virorum.* A. 1, 101. *scuta virum galeasque.*

Mr. Heitland thinks it possible that the title *Pharsalia* was not Lucan's own, but *De Bello Civili*. I am however disposed to agree with Teuffel that Statius's phrase *Pharsalia bella* and Lucan's *Pharsalia nostra* are decisive in favour of the traditional title, and that when Petronius, just before his delicious parody (which Mr. Heitland, I think, takes too seriously), speaks of *belli civilis ingens opus*, he is purposely veiling the personal allusion. It might have been observed that when Servius or the grammarians quote Lucan, they generally say *Lucanus* simply, or *Lucanus in primo, secundo, &c.*

From the evidence afforded by Petronius's parody, Mr. Heitland thinks it probable that the *Pharsalia* was published at its present length, or nearly so, in the lifetime of Lucan.

The discussions in the fourth chapter on the relations of Lucan to Nero and the empire, and to contemporary philosophical systems, are full of value and interest. In section 6 (Lucan's relations to learning and history) there is no attempt to ascertain the historical authorities used by Lucan, and no adequate treatment of his intellectual relations to the younger Seneca. Much more should have been said of Livy, who is quoted by the Berne Commenta on II. 593, III. 182, IV. 354, V. 494, VIII. 91. And neither here nor on p. cxxix., where the Senecas are briefly mentioned, is any notice taken of the important essay by Hermann Diels (*Seneca und Lucan*), published in 1886 in the *Transactions of the Berlin Academy of Sciences* for 1885. This paper proves that Lucan's verses on the sources of the Nile, in the tenth book, are a mere poetical paraphrase of part of the *Naturales Quaestiones* (iv. 1, 2).

Mr. Heitland's strongest interest appears to lie in history and literary criticism. To the palaeographical parts of an editor's task he expresses an indifference which in so careful a student is difficult to understand. 'It is no part of my plan,' he says, 'to speak of the seventy-five or eighty manuscripts (which I have not seen).' Well and good; but there are occasions in life (supposing, for instance, that tyrannicide is in contemplation) when, however unwilling you may feel to do the business yourself, you would recommend a friend to come forward. With this fact in mind the reader will perhaps turn hopefully to Mr. Haskins's commentary to see whether anything had been done to sift the manuscript evidence. If so, he will be sent back

The Publisher has had a strong and handsome cloth cover prepared which will be sent out with the Index and Title-page to Volume I. to all subscribers to the CLASSICAL REVIEW who signify their wish to receive it.

The price is 2s. 6d.

aching with disappointment. He should have remembered that Mr. Haskins says he makes no attempt to produce a critical text; that is, to ascertain what Lucan really wrote. Does the absurd fallacy then still linger, which we remember used to be preached some five-and-twenty years ago by high authorities in Oxford, that you can separate textual criticism from interpretation? Is it still supposed anywhere that all a commentator has to do is to take a decent printed text, construe straight through it, and add such remarks as are suggested by his knowledge and intelligence? Such an idea must have existed in England when some of the early volumes of the *Bibliotheca Classica* were published. But that anything distantly resembling it should live on in England, and at Cambridge, in 1887, we had thought inconceivable.

Mr. Haskins's commentary, to which we now turn, is of unequal merit. It has several qualities not only excellent but rare in such works: it is terse, elegant, and readable: the translations, which are numerous, are neat and clear: and much information is compressed into a small space. On the other hand one has to complain that (as said above) no attempt is made to do anything for the text, even in the way of putting together information now easily accessible. There is no mention of Steinhart and his high estimate of the *Montepessulanus* H. 113 and the *Vossianus secundus*,¹ nor of Kindler's discussion of the supposed interpolations. No hint is given that Lucan is quoted by the ancient grammarians, mainly by Priscian and the Probus of the *Catholica* and *Instituta*. No modern conjectures, or hardly any, are mentioned, not even those of Madvig in his *Adversaria*. No attempt is made to use the scholia critically, though as far back as 1869 Usener published the *Commenta Bernensia* separately, and thereby laid the foundation for future commentaries. Whether even the *scholia* printed by Weber have been much consulted seems doubtful. Finally it must be said that many difficulties which require to be seriously grappled with are passed over, while many unimportant and sometimes irrelevant parallel passages are allowed to occupy valuable space. At times also Mr. Haskins shows an uncertain hold on Latin usage. The following instances will show what is meant:—

¹ In the essay above mentioned Diels uses twelve MSS. of Lucan: two *Bernenses* (45 and 370); *Erlangensis* 856, *Gemblacensis* (= *Bruxellensis* 5330); two *Montepessulani* (H. 113, 362); two *Parisini* (8039, 7900 A); two *Vossiani*, and two *Berolinenses*.

I. 8. Priscian (vol. ii. p. 153 Hertz) quotes this line with *insania ferri*, not *licentia ferri*. This is not mentioned, but the reading derives support from Aen. 7, 461, above quoted. 19. *Seres* is singular: see Probus *Cathol.* p. 27 Keil. 50. Priscian i. p. 345 reads *iuvat*, perhaps rightly. 110. Priscian i. p. 310 reads *possidet* for *continet*. 176. Though Priscian ii. p. 185 says that *coactae* refers to *plebiscita*, he spells *plebiscita*: which probably shows that Bentley was right in reading *plebis scita coactae*, *coactae* agreeing with *plebis*. 304. for *transcenderet* Probus *De Ultimis Syllabis* p. 224 (Keil) reads *transcenderit*: far better. 481. Priscian i. p. 328 reads *Alpemque*, quoting also Lucan iii. 299 for the singular. 531. For *denso aere* Priscian (i. p. 520, ii. 473) twice quotes *tenso aere*. II. 263. *Incassum eat*, 'be spent in vain.' Read *in cassum eat*, literally 'run to emptiness.' 288. *Crimen erit superis et me fecisse nocentem*, 'The blame for my guilt will rest with the gods.' Is it not rather 'to have made me too (or even me) guilty, will be a reproach to the gods'? This use of *crimen* is tolerably common in Lucan, though, as far as I have seen, only once recognized by Mr. Haskins, viz. on viii. 800: but comp. v. 59, vi. 248, vii. 112, 398, 551: viii. 420. III. 358. *nostri fiducia cursus* 'Confidence in my journey, i.e. reliance on that as an obstacle.' Rather 'confidence in my haste, in the fact that I am in a hurry': comp. v. 482. *sunt cetera cursu Acta meo*. 404. *Structae diris altaribus arae*. Here *altaria* probably means 'offerings,' as in Vergil Ecl. v. 66. 455. *Stellatis axibus*. The Berne scholia clear up this passage by explaining *stellati* as = *cancellati*: the planks enclosing the *agger* or earth are arranged in lattice fashion so as to make a frame. 534. *Ordine contentae gemino crevisse liburnae*. 'To have reached such a size as to have one bank of oars.' The Berne scholia interpret *crevisse* as referring to the upper row of the *biremis* having more oars than the lower. 559. *Paterisne acies errare profundo Artibus et certas pelagi?* No explanation is offered of this difficult passage: is *et certas* a corruption for *expertas*? 586. For *Tagus* Sergius on Donatus p. 497 Keil reads *Catus*, and so the two Vossiani. 604. For *mixtis* the Berne scholia must have read *missis*; 'obliquo pectine,' *si enim dimittunt remos nautae, obliqua palmula natant*. *Pecten* would thus = *palmula*, perhaps on the analogy of the Greek *πληκτρον*. 708-9 require a much fuller explanation than is offered. IV. 171. which is absent from several MSS. is probably, as Kindler says, a gloss on the preceding line.

V. 54-56. No note is offered on the personages here mentioned: nor again is any explanation given of the allusions in vv. 109-110 (*sustulit iras—æra tabificum*). 457. *Movitque Ceraunia nautis*, 'brought Ceraunia nearer to the sailors.' Hardly Latin: the Berne scholia say *quoniam montes navigantibus moveri videntur*. 795-6. *Neuterque recedens Sustinuit dixisse vale*. Rightly condemned by Kindler as absent from Montepess. and Voss. sec. (first hands), and as probably a gloss on the preceding words. VI. 382. *Bebrycio*, all the scholia. 475. *Direxit* (made straight) should certainly be written *derexit*: indeed there is some carelessness about orthography in this text, which allows *nequidquam*, *querela*, *dirigit*, *negligo*, *tentare*, and *poenitet* to survive here and there. VII. 2. The Berne scholia mention a variant *lucifugus* for *luctificus*. 141. "*Erigitur* 'is straightened.'" Surely *erigitur* cannot bear this meaning; I had conjectured *derigitur*, when I found that it was the reading of the Berne scholia. 199. Kindler reads *numen* for *lumen*, perhaps rightly. 257-8. *Haec eadem est hodie quæ pignora quæque penates Reddat, et emerito faciat vos Marte colonos*. These lines are omitted in Voss. sec. and added outside the text in Montepess. Kindler points out that *emerito Marte* is not Latin, nor the variant *emeritos Marte*, and rightly condemns them. 325. Mr. Haskins translates *iugulum* 'slaughter': with what authority? It is difficult not to suppose the word to be corrupt. *Ignoti hostis* seems most naturally to mean an 'unknown,' i.e. plebeian, enemy: compare 578. *In plebem vetat ire manus monstratque senatum*; then, reading *imputet* with the Berne scholia, we get the general sense that Caesar will count the slaughter of a plebeian as a crime. 398. *Crimen civile*: not 'the guilty result of civil war,' but 'a reproach to the citizens.' 451.

Thyestes the Berne scholia, rightly. 607. The variant mentioned by the scholia, *succensor* for *successor*, should have been mentioned. VIII. 332. *Secundum Emathiam lis tanta datur* = in favour of Emathia: not 'in accordance with the verdict of Thessaly.' 474. '*Monstra*, cf. infr. 548'; 548. '*For monstra* cf. 474. supr.' 837. '*Si saecula prima Victoris timuere minas*, i.e. cum recens vicerat Caesar. Schol.' Surely the meaning must be 'if the former generations of Rome were afraid that the conqueror would violate, as he had threatened to do, the ashes of the conquered'; in allusion to such a fear, for instance, as moved Sulla to give orders for the burning of his body after death. IX. 435. *Nulla sub illa Cura Iovis terra est*: 'under that ground there is no thought of the sky': as the Berne scholia say, *non curat si non pluât*. In 437 *inmotis* seems to mean 'not stirred by cultivation.' X. 110. *Romana in saecula*: 'fashion, manners.' Can *saecula* mean this, which is usually expressed by *saeculum*? or does not *Romana saecula* rather mean 'the generations of Rome?' True, Juvenal (IV. 68) says *tua servatum consume in saecula rhombum*: 'your ages'; this, however, is the grandiose language of flattery. *Saecula* is also used as = *saeculum*, fashion, in the *Epicedion Drusi*: but this is just one of the points which make against the antiquity of that poem. 219. '*Veterum*, e.g. Euripidis.' Diels points out that the theory came from Anaxagoras, and was also known to Aeschylus.

These remarks are made in the hope that the book, which will certainly hold the field in England, and justly, for a long time to come, may be improved in a second edition. No superhuman labour would be required to this end. It is much to be wished, on all accounts, that a second edition may soon be in demand.

H. NETTLESHIP.

A. MÜLLER'S GREEK THEATRE.

Die Griechischen Bühnenalterthümer. Von ALBERT MÜLLER. Freiburg i. B. 1886. Pp. viii. 432. 10 Mk.

A. MÜLLER originally intended, as we learn from his preface, to treat his subject as an appendix to the third volume of Blümmner and Dittenberger's new edition of K. Fr. Hermann's standard work on *Greek Antiquities*; but as the subject required a fuller treatment than it would have been possible

to give it in this shape, he decided to publish it as part 2 of this volume. The book, which contains twenty-two illustrations and plans, is divided into three chapters; the first (p. 1 to 106) deals with the structure of the theatre; first beginnings of dramatic performances; sites and ruins of theatres; the ground-plan of a Greek theatre according to Vitruvius; stage, place of spectators, orchestra; acoustic properties; technical names for the different parts of a theatre; the

Odeion; uses to which theatres were put when not required for performances; the theatres of Athens and Attica. In the second chapter (p. 107 to 308) the parts of a performance are discussed—places of actors and chorus, decorations, doors of the stage, etc.; changes of scene, etc.; actors and acting; chorus; dresses in tragedy, satyric drama, and comedy; masks; spectators. The third chapter (p. 308 to 414) treats of the times when performances took place; the expenses of such performances; poets and instructors of the chorus; state copy of plays, etc.; proagon, judges, didascalia; dramatic performances outside Attica; *σύνοδοι τῶν περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον τεχνικῶν*. Then follow four pages of addenda and three indices. In the former Müller touches on various points raised in recent publications which he was not able to make use of for the body of the work, and which tend to upset generally received opinions. Lipsius *e.g.* has shown that the comedies were performed separately on one day before the tragedies, that the choregus in a dramatic contest competed in his own name, not in that of his *φυλή*, and that in such a contest not a tripod but a tablet was awarded as prize for the best performance. The views expressed by von Wilamowitz years ago (cf. *Hermes* 21, 4, p. 597 foll.) have been borne out by the excavations in the Dionysiac theatre at Athens, the results of which Dörpfeld has communicated to Müller; he says, before the fourth century there was only a large circular orchestra of polygonal stones, close to the old Dionysiac temple; there were no stone seats, but the spectators sat on the slopes of the Acropolis or at most on wooden benches; there was no solidly built *σκηνή*. Besides this there was a second orchestra in the market-place (to the west of the Areiopagus) which was probably built in the same way. Here it was always necessary to erect high scaffolding for seats, since there was no slope here.—Is this latter not almost certainly the *ὀρχήστρα* mentioned in Plat. *Apol.* 26 D? In Boeckh's opinion this passage refers to the sale of books in the orchestra of the Dionysiac theatre when no performances were going on; Fränkel in his edition of the *Staatshaushalt* (ii. p. 13* f.) objects to this view, and sees in the passage rather an allusion to performances in the theatre (at a drachma admission for the three days) of plays of Euripides which were saturated with the doctrines of Anaxagoras. L. C. Purser (*Class. Rev.* no. 5 and 6, p. 150), as I think, effectually meets Fränkel's objections, and A. Müller (p. 82 n.) is no doubt

right in following Schöne, who holds that the passage refers to the trade in books which was carried on in that part of the market-place called *ὀρχήστρα*; Photius has s.v. *ὀρχήστρα πρῶτον ἐκλήθη ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ*, and Nicophon (Mein. *fr. com.* ii. 2, p. 852) points to the same locality, when he mentions the *βιβλιοπῶλαι* amongst the motley crowd of sellers of figs, leather, spoons, sieves, etc., whom we can only expect to find in the market-place. Whilst Müller's view on this point seems to me preferable to that of Fränkel, the latter (ii. p. 111* f.) is probably right in what he says about the *ἀγωνοθέτης*. If that official, who remained in office a whole year, had had to defray all the expenses of all the choruses out of his own pocket (p. 340), it would have been singularly ungracious on the part of the *δῆμος* to deprive him of the title of *χορηγός*, for *ὁ δῆμος ἐχορήγει, ἀγωνοθέτης ὁ δέεινα*, etc. In some instances (*e.g.* *C.I.G.* 1444) it would indeed seem that the *ἀγωνοθέτης* defrayed all the expenses, but on the other hand it is clear from an inscription from Iasus (Le Bas-Waddington, iii. no. 255) that the *ἀγωνοθέτης* there did not do so, for the names of several citizens besides the *ἀγωνοθέτης* are given as having furnished funds. Moreover we find in inscriptions the phrase *ἀγωνοθετοῦντος διὰ βίου* (Tralles, Colossae, *Bull. de Corr. Hell.* xi. p. 298, p. 354). Fränkel (ii. p. 125*), as it seems to me, is again right in following Thumser, who infers from Dem. 20, 18 foll. that metoecs could perform at Athens choregia on other festivals than that of the Lenaea; for metoec choregi in Iasus and Rhodes, see Le Bas-Waddington iii. no. 256, and Ross, *inscr. ined.* no. 278. In connexion with this question a few other points might have been touched on, such as the voluntary choregia *e.g.* of Hypereides (Ps. Plut. *vit.* x. *orat.* p. 848 E), for being trierarch at the time he was exempt; the official title *τὸ ἀγωνάρχῃ* in a Boeotian inscription (Collitz, *Samml. d. gr. Dialekt.-Inscr.* i. no. 812a). In other parts of the book too I have noticed some slight omissions; on p. 295 the *νομοφύλακες* are not mentioned as possessing *προεδρία* (*Lex. Rhet. Cantabr.* p. 673, 27 foll. *καὶ ἐν ταῖς θέαις ἐναντίον τῶν ἀρχόντων ἐκαθέζοντο* cf. Photius s.v. *οἱ νομοφύλακες τίνες*); on p. 387 an inscription from Samos giving a list of victors at the Heraea (P. Gardner, *Journ. of Hell. Stud.* vii. p. 147 foll.) is not referred to (l. 3 *ὑποκριτῆς παλαιᾶς τραγωδίας Δημήτριος*, l. 8 *τοὺς ποιητὰς τῶν καινῶν τραγωδιῶν . . . τοὺς ποιητὰς τῶν καινῶν κωμωδιῶν*); the first Amphictyonic decree (p. 394, n. 3) dates from shortly after 279 B.C., for

the Phocians did not belong to the Amphictyonic confederacy from 345 to 279 B.C., and lastly, the question as to the number of choreutae who voted in the trial of Orestes might have been more fully treated (p. 202, n. 3); Müller puts little faith in the statements of scholiasts (p. 108), yet here he says,

Für die Eum. sind 15 Choreuten bezeugt, (schol. Aesch. *Eum.* 585) ! did twelve vote, as O. Müller and Wecklein (*Philol.* 1884, p. 712 f.) think, or an uneven number, eleven according to Hermann, or nine, as Zawadzki (*Die Anzahl der Ariop. in Aesch. Eum.*) suggests? for, as Kirchhoff has shown, Athena as ἡγεμών of the court of Areiopagus possessed the right of voting, and the trial was looked upon as a precedent to establish the principle that even votes amounted to an acquittal. Yet these are small matters when compared with the full and lucid account Müller gives of a confessedly difficult subject.

HERMAN HAGER.

[APPENDIX TO DR. HAGER'S ARTICLE.]

IT is worthy of notice that the results of the recent excavations in the Dionysiac theatre can be corroborated, in one important particular, by literary evidence. In the *Oedipus Coloneus*, when Creon lays his hand upon Antigone, and asserts his right to remove her from Colonus, the Chorus approach him with menacing gestures, saying, τάχ' εἰς βάσανον εἴ χερῶν. Creon answers, εἶργον, 'stand back!' The Chorus rejoin, σοῦ μὲν οὐ, τάδε γε μωμένον (835 f.). It is evident that the poet conceives them as standing close to him. Now, according to old notions, Creon would at this time have been on the raised λογεῖον, while the Chorus were below him in the ὀρχήστρα. The scene loses much of its natural force, if we have to imagine the Chorus as merely advancing, in an excited manner, to the foot of a platform on which Creon stands. But it becomes at once fully intelligible, if we suppose that Creon and the Chorus are standing on the same level; i.e., that the place from which

the actors spoke was in the time of Sophocles—and the *Coloneus* probably belongs to his latest years—merely a segment of the circular ὀρχήστρα. It is now believed that this ὀρχήστρα was enclosed (as noticed above), by polygonal stones, but had, as yet, no permanent σκηνή behind it. A permanent raised stage of masonry, and a permanent σκηνή, appear to have been erected for the first time under the auspices of Lycurgus, *circa*. 330 B.C. I am informed by Professor D'Ooge, late Director of the American School at Athens; that the results obtained in the Dionysiac theatre have been confirmed in some points by a recent examination of the theatres at Oropus and Sicyon. It is also said to be probable that, in the circular ὀρχήστρα of the pre-Lycurgean period, the actors used only one entrance. The traditional three doors were a later development.

Here, however, we must not forget the ἐκκύκλημα. As the recent explorers of the Dionysiac theatre doubtless remember, the use of that contrivance is not merely an inference from the tragic texts, but is proved by the two parodies in comedy,—Aristophanes using the verbs ἐκκυκλεῖν and ἐσκυκλεῖν (*Ach.* 408, *Th.* 265). It seems to have been a low stage, pushed forward through the central door. (See A. Müller, in the work noticed above, pp. 142–148.) While granting, then, that there was no permanent σκηνή in the time of Aristophanes, we must also suppose that there was some temporary screen, by which the imaginary interior of a house could be veiled from the view of the spectators. There is nothing in the recent results which excludes the use of such a temporary screen, any more than that of a θεολογεῖον for the *deus ex machina*. But it seems as if we must give up the περίακτοι, which can hardly have come in before the permanent σκηνή. Their case is different from those just noticed, since nothing in the texts requires them. Niejahr, indeed, had already denied the use of the περίακτοι in the best age (*Quaest. Arist. Scaen.*, pp. 8–12.)

R. C. JERR.

The Gentleman's Magazine Library: Romano-British Remains. Part 1, edited by G. L. GOMME, F.S.A. (Elliott Stock), pp. xxiv. 297. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

FROM its foundation in 1731 till 1868 the *Gentleman's Magazine* was one of the chief archaeological journals in England. The Society of Antiquaries began its series of publications in 1770; the Archaeological Institute and Association about 1845; and since 1868 the *Gentleman's Magazine* itself has neglected antiquities. But before that date its editors included

archaeology among the many subjects which interested the cultivated gentleman, and the paper was a recognised organ, as indeed it was the only monthly organ, of those who wished to read or write about matters archaeological. Thus its volumes became a store-house for antiquarian information of the most varied character, embracing notices of discoveries in England or abroad, descriptions of churches and old houses, and the like. The idea of collecting 'a volume of antiquities' from this valuable but unsorted treasury is no new one: it was suggested by a correspondent

of Sylvanus Urban in 1753. But though Hübner and others examined the *Magazine* for special purposes, nothing more was done till Mr. Gomme undertook to edit 'a classified collection of its principal contents' down to 1868, whether archaeological or otherwise. Of this 'Gentleman's Magazine Library,' eight handsome volumes have already appeared, and nine or ten more are promised.

The last addition to the series is that bearing the somewhat misleading title *Romano-British Remains*, of which part 1 is before us. This is intended—though, as I shall have to point out, the execution falls short of this—to contain all the notices in the *Magazine* which relate to the discovery of Roman remains in our islands. The extracts are mostly printed in full, and are arranged in alphabetical order of counties. If I have calculated right, the present volume includes some 330 of these extracts, taking us down to Somerset. The other English counties, Wales, Scotland, notes and index will follow in a second volume. It is interesting to observe that of the 330 extracts before us, nearly 200 are dated later than 1830. The first twenty years of the *Magazine* yield only seven extracts, while 1836–44 supply 82, and 1862–68, the last seven years, produce 56.

But before criticizing the book itself, a few words are due to the interesting introduction with which Mr. Gomme has prefaced it. Here he discusses the character of the Roman occupation, arguing that it was military and not social: Roman Britain, he says, meant only the luxurious occupiers of villas, the town merchants, and the garrison. This, of course, resembles the view taken by Hübner in his preface to the seventh volume of the *Corpus*; but Mr. Gomme is more concerned to combat the theories of Coote and Seeböhm and deny the alleged continuity between Roman and English history. This he attempts to do by placing the break in the history at 410: the Romans, he thinks, left little trace of themselves in the land. He may be right—one cannot here discuss the question in full—but I fancy that there is a slight confusion in his argument. The continuity between Roman and Briton is one thing, that between Briton and Saxon another, and Mr. Gomme seems to use against the former evidence which really makes only against the latter. The result is that he disproves Mr. Seeböhm's view, but does not prove his own. And I think he might have alluded to Bath. There Roman and Saxon dwelt on the same spot; but it is perfectly certain that Aquae Sulis lay waste and deserted for years before it became Akemanceaster. I trust he will pardon me if I point out two slips in his most admirable essay. It is not true that 'no indications of settled occupation have been found in Derbyshire' (see *C.I.L.* vii. 177, and *Archaeol.* x. 17), nor is it correct to say that 'Herefordshire contained one station'; probably there were three. I must demur also to the terms in which Mr. Gomme bids his readers consult the map in Mr. Scarth's *Roman Britain*. That map, which does duty for other books beside Mr. Scarth's, is the reverse of good, and I do not understand Mr. Gomme's mention of it.

For the book itself Mr. Gomme claims a twofold importance. It is a representative record of the Roman remains actually found in England, and it is a contribution towards a complete index of such remains. No one would deny the value of a work which could justly claim to be either of these things, but I regret to say that it is difficult to allow the claim in the case of the present volume. To some extent this is due to the circumstances of the case. The contributions to the *Gentleman's Magazine* were made rather at random. Many finds were not communicated to its pages; when they were, it was a

chance whether the correspondents knew Latin. The unscholarliness of most English archaeologists is no better illustrated than in these pages, though there are of course honourable exceptions, like Mr. Roach Smith. However, these defects are unavoidable. The value of the book is far more seriously damaged by faults which could have been avoided and which are indeed not yet irremediable. The worst of these is that the collection is by no means complete. I have gone through thirty out of the first ninety volumes of the *Magazine*, and have tested the book in other ways, and the result is not satisfactory. Thus the book gives seven extracts on Cheshire, and omits at least four others of importance (1764, p. 510; 1862, March, p. 319, July, p. 59; 1868, March, p. 765). It gives seven extracts on Bath and omits three notable ones (1739, p. 622; 1804, 2, p. 1006; 1829, 1, p. 31). It gives three extracts for Manchester and omits three (1807, 2, p. 1,009; 1820, 1, p. 351; 1832, 2, p. 359). Again, it includes nothing from the year 1764: there are certainly two passages worth quoting (pp. 248, 510). It includes nothing from 1800; I have noticed three passages (pp. 513, 1,095, 1,137). Almost the first discovery noticed in the *Magazine* (1735, p. 217), the remarkable silver dish found at Corstopitum, is absent. Now these figures are only representative, and I fear they entirely dispose of Mr. Gomme's claim that the volume is a contribution to an index. I do not wish to blame Mr. Gomme for the omissions. We are nowhere told who searched the magazine for extracts, and he is probably not responsible for this part of the work. Nor should I wish to judge such omissions hardly: I know by bitter experience how easy it is to make them. But that does not alter the fact that the book *is* too imperfect to be of use. I hope Mr. Gomme will have the *Magazine* searched afresh, and give us a supplement in Part 2. There must be some sixty extracts omitted at the lowest estimate.

Conversely, I am inclined to think that Mr. Gomme has sometimes included remains which are not Roman. I see no evidence to show that the chains, &c., mentioned as found at Horsefield (p. 94) are really Roman, and I have still stronger doubts about the brass lamp from Hinckley (p. 167). The illustration given in the *Magazine* (1801, 2, 797), but not repeated by Mr. Gomme, is not at all like a Roman lamp.

Indeed, the absence of the original illustrations is a serious defect. Frequently one is perfectly helpless without them. One extract, for example (1774, p. 512), reads 'Figs. I. and II. were found at Cilchester (*sic*) in Hants, and are judged to be great curiosities.' The value of this is not very obvious when no figures are given. The case is even worse where, as is not seldom the case, the text is not merely meaningless but actually misleading. Thus the future antiquary who trusts in this book, and copies the inscriptions on pp. 22–25, will go grievously astray; but any one who will consult the original magazine (1752, p. 105) will find tolerably correct illustrations. No doubt a reprint of these illustrations would be costly, but without that, or an equivalent description, the usefulness of the work is much impaired.

Another question concerns the notes. These are to follow in Part 2, but so far as we can judge from Mr. Gomme's references, they will be much too few in number. For example, antiquaries should be warned that the 'tessera' from Littleboro', on p. 260, is no tessera at all, but an oculist's stamp. This is another case where the original illustration would be helpful, to say the least.

I regard it as a great pity, too, that the coin-finds are omitted, and reserved for a volume of 'Numis-

matics.' They are quite out of place in such a volume: no numismatist cares to hear that thirty or forty third brass of the Antonines were found at such and such a place. On the other hand the information is invaluable to the student of Roman Britain. I would suggest that a list be added to Part 2 of all the coin-finds, indicating simply the place of discovery and the supposed dates.

Perhaps it is unnecessary to add that there are a few slips of less importance, such as occur in most books. Thus a Housesteads inscription is printed under Cumberland (p. 26). The references to the *Corpus* are very often omitted (e.g. pp. 22-24), and are given rather clumsily. One would prefer 'C.I.L. vii. 171' to 'Huebner p. 49.' There are also a few misprints.

The conclusion of the whole matter is that the book is very unsatisfactory, but that the defects can be greatly remedied in Part 2. The most disappointing feature is the incompleteness. Mr. Gomme in his preface lays great stress on the value of the work as a contribution to an index of all the Roman remains in England, and it is rather trying to find that so far this contribution is worthless. He complains that the Index Society have been deaf to appeals to undertake the work. I am afraid that, unless Part 2 of the *Romano-British Remains* is better than Part 1, the Society will continue to be deaf. And yet the work is sorely needed. I suspect, however, that more has been done towards it than Mr. Gomme thinks, and that what is really wanted is unity. At present we are all by ourselves doing the same things and wasting labour. Thus that indefatigable antiquarian, Mr. Thompson Watkin, had indexed the *Gentleman's Magazine* for his own use long before Mr. Gomme's book was thought of. With division of labour a new *Britannia Romana* ought to be possible, only the labour must be thorough and scholarly. Absolute completeness may be unattainable, though Mr. Watkin's works on Cheshire and Lancashire, and Hübner's *Corpus*, show that one can come very near it. But an imperfect index is as bad as none, and the contribution now before us is decidedly imperfect.

F. HAVERFIELD.

DIONYSIOS OR LONGINOS ON SUBLIMITY OF STYLE.¹

It is a matter of uncertainty who was really the author of the treatise 'On sublimity of style' which used generally to be attributed to Cassius Longinos, the teacher of Zenobia. That it was written by him there is positively no evidence; but that it was written by some rhetor whose name was either Longinos or Dionysios is probable from the fact that the title of the work in the best MS. is *Διονυσίου ἢ Λογγίνου περὶ ὕψους*: and thus those who attribute it to Dionysios of Halikarnassos or Dionysios of Pergamos are more likely to be right than those who attribute it to Plutarch.

One of the first things to be observed about this striking treatise—for it is striking in ability, in delicacy of judgment, in cultured urbanity—is the high spiritual tone which we can detect, and sometimes are not obliged to detect, behind the scientific analysis. Take the following passage, for example, which occurs in a comparison drawn between a Plato who often slips and a Lysias who is always correct.

'Of what did those divine ones who aimed at the

highest effects of literary composition take regard? As well as of many other things they had regard of this—that nature namely did not judge man to be a mean or ungenerous animal, but that introducing us into life, into the universe, as into a great assembly, to be spectators of her contests, and to be keen competitors in their rivalries, she implanted in our souls from the beginning an irrepressible love of whatever was great and nobler than ourselves—τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ ὡς πρὸς ἡμᾶς δαιμονιωτέρου. And therefore the whole world, even, is not enough to satisfy the speculation and apprehension of human understanding, but our reflexions often travel beyond the bounds of our environment; and if one consider life in all its aspects, and behold the abundance of greatness and beauty in its sundry spheres, he will soon be aware to what things we are born. And thus it is the guidance of nature that we follow when we admire not small streams, translucent and of service though they be, but admire the Nile, the Danube, the Rhine, and yet more the Ocean. . . .'

In this passage there is no attempt at effect, there is not the faintest touch of rhapsody; the writer does not exceed the strict limits of the matter in hand. But we can feel the high-spirited tone behind the Hellenic reserve and penetrating it.

Whether the author's name be Longinos or not, he certainly deserves the fame for critical acumen which attached in later times to a rhetor of that name, just as Dionysios was noted for his much learning. The judgments and the critical observations contained in this treatise are so good, so penetrating, that when we have read a few pages we feel complete confidence in the writer's powers; they are also full of surprises—a subtle remark meets us when we fancied that the criticism was complete.

For example having explained in a phrase worth remembering that ὕψος, 'the grand style,' is an echoed reflex of grandeur of soul, μεγαλοφροσύνης ἀπήχημα, he observes that in some lofty moods silence is more than all echoes—the silence for instance of Aias among the shades:

ὡς ἐφάμην ὁ δὲ μ' οὐδὲν ἀμείβετο· βῆ δὲ μετ' ἄλλας
ψυχὰς εἰς ἔρεβος νεκρῶν κατατεθνηῶτων.

Again in explaining the difference between real and false grandeur of style, he quotes some lines from the *Arimaspeia* of Aristeas (a history of the Hyperboreans), describing the perils of sailors, of which one verse was

ῥμματ' ἐν ἄστροισι ψυχὴν δ' ἐνὶ πόντῳ ἔχουσιν.

'It is manifest,' he says, 'that this description is less fearful than flowery'—πλέον ἄρθος ἔχει τὰ λεγόμενα ἢ δέος. This criticism is happy, and is without a superfluous syllable: the writer always knows where to stop. The urbanity is also to be observed; another critic would not hesitate to call the lines frigid—ψυχρά, whilst our critic with an urbanity that is really more crushing says, they are 'less fearful than flowery.' He then takes an example of true ὕψος from Homer to set beside the false ὕψος of Aristeas:

ἐν δ' ἔπεισ' ὡς ὅτε κῆμα θοῇ ἐν νηὶ πέσῃσι
λαβρὸν ὑπὸ νεφέων ἀνεμοτρεφές, ἣ δὲ τε πᾶσα
ἄχνη ὑπεκρέφθη, ἀνέμοιο δὲ δεινὸς ἀήτης
ἰστίῳ ἐμβρέμεται, τρομέουσι δὲ τε φρένα ναῦται
δειδιδότες· τυτθὸν γὰρ ὑπὲρ θανάτοιο φέρονται.

The idea of the last line Aratos tried to express more vividly by

ὀλίγον δὲ διὰ ξύλον αἰδ' ἐρύκει.

¹ *Διονυσίου ἢ Λογγίνου περὶ ὕψους*. Editio O. Jahn, 1867. Iterum editio J. Vahlen, 1887. (Bonn.) 2 Mk. 40.

But the turn thus given to the idea is observed to be γλαφυρόν, 'elegant'; it has not the austerity of grandeur. And besides, says the so-called Longinos, 'he bars the danger by saying ξύλον αἰδ' ἀπείργει—a plank keeps death off. Why then, it does keep death off, οὐκοῦν ἀπείργει.' What criticism could be more complete, more happily expressed! That is the sort of criticism that gives us confidence in the writer. 'Homer, on the other hand, does not bar the danger once for all, but portrays those who are continually exposed to risks by sea, in which they frequently perish.' And now we suppose that he has nothing more to say, and are prepared to pass to some new topic or example. But no, there is a surprise awaiting us; the critic reveals yet a new excellence in the passage of Homer before he leaves it. He points out that by compressing the prepositions ὑπό and ἐκ into a conjunction contrary to the nature of prepositions, and therefore with a certain violence or torture, the poet has excellently imitated and 'all but engraved in his phrase the violence of the danger which he describes in the words ὑπὲκ θανάτοιο φέρονται.'

Again the comparison instituted between Cicero and Demosthenes is really masterly in its way. Pointing out that the grandeur of the Greek orator has something 'abrupt' about it, while the Roman excels in diffusiveness (χύσις), he compares the former to a lightning flash which carries all before it in a straight line, while Cicero resembles the spreading fire that advances more leisurely and consumes all things round about it on its way. This comparison most felicitously expresses the directness and impetus of Demosthenes, and the diffusiveness, the *Umsichgreifen* of Cicero.

The unflinching urbanity, to which I already drew attention, is accompanied by a kindred quality, freedom from dogmatism. While the author finds fault with Kekilius, who had written before him on the same subject, he excuses him, and speaks of him with respect. He is fond of introducing his judgments with an undogmatic μήποτε, 'perhaps.' At the same time, he is quite unprejudiced, and deals with the poet—for whom he has the profoundest admiration—in a critical manner which would have astonished Strabo. He considers that the Odyssey bears unmistakable marks of having been composed in old age—but, as he gracefully adds, it was the old age of Homer. Throughout the whole treatise is conspicuous Greek moderation of judgment and expression.

In one place, speaking of the Dii maiores—Homer, Plato, Demosthenes—he says that all time, unable to be misled by envy, has given them a prize of victory which cannot be taken away, and will last 'as long as water flows and tall trees bloom'—ἔστ' ἂν ὕδωρ τε ῥέη καὶ δένδρεα μακρὰ τεθήλη. Here is an ancient parallel to Swinburne's

'Earth and ocean shall be shadows when Prometheus shall be dead.'

Jahn's edition of the treatise appeared in 1867; Vahlen's edition in 1887 is a re-edition of Jahn's. Vahlen had, at Jahn's request, collated the chief MS. P (Parisiensis of 10th century) as long ago as 1861 and has since made many contributions to the criticism of the text, so that no one was better qualified to bring out the new edition. A complete critical apparatus is subjoined to the text; and a third division of the page is occupied with a very serviceable list of references to passages mentioned in the treatise, and quotations bearing upon such references, as in Jahn's original edition. For example on p. 19, *à propos* of the ode of Sappho, the passages in Plutarch's *Erotika* and *Life of Demetrius* referring to that ode, the translation of

Catullus, and the lines of Lucretius which contain echoes from it, are quoted in full.

I may notice that lines 6 and 7 of the ode of Sappho are printed thus:—

ὥς σε γὰρ ἴδω, βροχέως με φώνας
οὐδὲν ἔτ' εἴκει.

This apparently is the reading of P., and, if so, Bergk is wrong in his critical note (P.Z.G. iii. p. 88) when he gives ὥς γὰρ σ' ἴδω as the reading of the MSS. It is important to remark that βροχέως should be taken with the apodosis in the sense of συντόμως. Compare Hesychios, βρουχέων ἢ βρουκε. . . . (read with Voss βρουχέως ἢ βροχέως) σαφῶς συντόμως. Αἰολεῖς. Vahlen does not mention Hartung's conjecture ἐκ βροχίοιο, *c. faucibus*. In l. 13 the MSS. ἀ δέ μ' ἰδρῶς κακχέεται is printed, and no mention is made of the impossible reading μίδρως which Bergk introduced into the text of his fourth edition. I still think that the right reading may be σίδρως, as I suggested in *Hermathena*, 1885 (σίδρως = σφίδρως, as σιγῶ = σφιδῶ; cf. *sudor*, *sweat*).

On p. 24 one of Bentley's most certain emendations is to be found—οὐκ ἔψυκται μὲν ἀλλ' οὐχ οὕτως ἀπαστράπτει (P. ἐπέστραπτai). In the chapter on imitation we come across the following sentence (p. 26):

ἔστιν δ' οὐ κλοπή τὸ πρᾶγμα ἀλλ' ὥς ἀπὸ καλῶν ἡθῶν ἢ πλασμάτων ἢ δημιουργημάτων ἀποτύπωσις.

Toup translates, 'Haec vero res non est furtum ullum sed (ut a bonis moribus fieri potest) sive simulacrum sive operum expressa effigies.' But Vahlen considers ἡθῶν corrupt, and accepts the εἰδῶν of Tollius, while Diels proposed λίθων. While I do not feel sure that any change is necessary, I would suggest, as nearer to the MSS. reading than either of these two conjectures, ὥς ἀπὸ καλῶν ἢ θεῶν ἢ πλασμάτων κ.τ.λ.: θεῶν = 'sights, spectacles,' compare θεαὶ ἀμήχανοι τὸ κάλλος in Plato's *Republic*.

In the able discussion of the σχῆμα ὁμοτικόν in cap. xvii. we read (p. 34), καὶ πῶς παραληφθεῖσαν ἡ τοῦ πανουργεῖν τέχνη τοῖς κάλλεσι καὶ μεγέθεσι τὸ λοιπὸν δέδουκεν καὶ πᾶσαν ὑπόψιν ἐκπέφυγεν, that is, the beauty and grandeur conceal the artifice of the artist. Vahlen adopts παραληφθεῖσα of Tollius. Kayser proposed περιληφθεῖσα, Ruhnken παρακαλυφθεῖσα. It seems to me that περιλαμφθεῖσα would be better than any of these proposals. For the sense compare cap. xv., p. 31, ᾧ τὸ πραγματικὸν ἐγκρύπτεται περιλαμπόμενον; and for the form cf. περιλαμφθεῖς, Josephus *Jud. Bell.* iv. 10, 1, and ἐλλαμφθήσεται, Plotinus, 30, 3.

P. 37, l. 5, Vahlen is certainly right in keeping ἀγανακτεῖ. The conjectures ἄγαν ἀργεῖ, ἀτονεῖ, ἀπακταίνει, &c., are quite uncalled for. P. 41, l. 21, in the passage on the ἐνάλλαξις προσώπων, there is a difficulty: διδὲ καὶ ἡ πρόχρησις τοῦ σχήματος τότε, ἡνίκ' ἂν ὀξὺς ὁ καιρὸς ὦν διαμέλλειν τῷ γράφοντι μὴ διδῶ κ.τ.λ. Here πρόχρησις is meaningless, and πρόσχρησις which Manutius proposed is little better. Speugel's ἡ χρῆσις does not account for προ, and Kayser's πρόχειρος ἡ χρῆσις involves too much change. I would suggest διδὲ καὶ ἡ κυρία χρῆσις τοῦ σχήματος τότε κ.τ.λ. This is just what the meaning requires, and κυρία might have become corrupted to προ. On p. 63, συγκοπή μὲν γὰρ κολουεῖ τὸν νοῦν, συντομία δ' ἐπ' εὐθύ calls for emendation. δ' ἄγει ἐπ' εὐθύ is the proposal of Stephanus, δ' ἐπευθύνει of Petra, δὲ σπένδει of Rohde. I would propose

συντομία δ' ἐπ' εὐθύ δεῖ,

the omission of the verb being accounted for by the similarity of the last syllable of εὐθύ.

On p. 8 an extremely clever emendation of Rohde is mentioned in the notes, but has not been adopted in the text. The MSS. have δ μέντοι Τίμαιος ὡς φωρίου τινὸς ἐφαπτόμενος, οὐδὲ τοῦτο Ξενοφῶντι τὸ ψυχρὸν κατέλιπεν. Now the point is not that Timaios plagiarised, but that what he plagiarised was frigid and tasteless; therefore φωρίου τινὸς requires correction. Rohde reads without changing a letter, φῶρ ἰοῦ τινὸς. A thief stealing poison is just the simile required.

Perhaps the most provoking passage in the whole treatise is the last sentence of the 10th chapter, which Vahlen prints thus (p. 23): λυμαίνεται γὰρ ταῦτα τὸ ὅλον ὥσανει ψύγματα ἢ ἀραιώματα ἐμποιοῦν τὰ μεγέθη συνοικονομούμενα τῇ πρὸς ἄλληλα σχέσει συντετειχισμένα. ἐμποιοῦν τὰ is Vahlen's emendation for ἐμποιοῦντα (P), and he explains his reading by ὥσανει ψύγματα ἐμποιοῦν τὰ μεγέθη λυμαίνεται. This is not satisfactory, for there is nothing to go with ἐμποιοῦν: the insertion of $\tau\iota$ before τὰ would be an improvement. The general sense of the passage is quite clear. The superfluities (φλοιῶδες ἢ ἄσεμνον ἢ σχολικόν) signified by ταῦτα, which spoil the grand whole, are compared to ψύγματα ἢ ἀραιώματα whose insertion in an edifice built of massive stones mutually supporting one another would spoil the effect. Perhaps the simplest change that will produce a satisfactory sentence is ἐμποιοῦμενα τὰ, the participle agreeing with ψύγματα and τὰ μεγέθη being an accusative after λυμαίνεται understood from the first clause; but palaeographically the emendation is not very neat. ἐμποιοῦντα may be a corruption of some participle of meaning similar to λυμαίνεται.

It is to be regretted that in an edition professedly designed *in usum scholarum* some of the difficulties of interpretation are not dealt with. For example a note would have been very acceptable on the difficult word ἀδρεπήβολον in cap. viii. The writer enumerates five sources of lofty style (ὕψιγορία). The first and best of these is τὸ περὶ τὰς νοήσεις ἀδρεπήβολον; the second is τὸ σφοδρὸν καὶ ἐνθουσιαστικὸν πάθος; these two are natural sources of sublimity, in contrast with the rest which are artificial, namely, the σχημάτων πλάσις, the γενναία φράσις, and the ἐν ἀξιώματι καὶ διάρσει σύνθεσις. He treats of each of these in order, but he does not again designate the first by the same phrase; he calls it τὸ μεγαλοφυές or μεγαλοφροσύνη. Perhaps some explanation of ἀδρεπήβολον was given in the missing part of cap. ix., but it is certainly a most strange substitute for μεγαλοφυές. The word ἀδρός in the sense, 'compact, close, concentrated,' might be intelligibly used of the σύνθεσις τῶν ἐμφερομένων (c. x.), in illustration of which the ode of Sappho is cited.

Another example of a difficulty which deserved a note is the remark at the end of cap. xxix. (p. 44), that passion participates in sublimity to the same extent that moral character participates in pleasure, πάθος δὲ ὕψους μετέχει τοσοῦτον ὅσους ἡθος ἡδονῆς. The remark is made *à propos* of the effects of artifices of style (σχήματα) in producing pathos. In what respect the relation of ἡθος to ἡδονή resembles the relation of πάθος to ὕψος, it is difficult to perceive; one critic considers the sentence spurious. It is perhaps the marginal note of a reader, to whom it occurred that every pleasure depends on certain subjective conditions of the sentient individual, which he loosely termed ἡθος (the character), and who, infelicitously conceiving that this fact was a suitable illustration of the dependence of ὕψος on πάθος, expressed his conception in equally infelicitous terms.

JOHN B. BURY.

Doctrina Duodecim Apostolorum, Canones Apostolorum Ecclesiastici Ac Reliquae Doctrinae De Duabus Viis Expositiones Veteres. Edidit FRANCISCUS XAVERIUS FUNK. Tübingen: Laupp (London: Trübner), 1887. 3 Mk. 60.

THIS is a complete and exhaustive commentary on the Teaching of the Apostles. The author gives in the Prolegomena an account of the discovery by Philotheus Bryennius, in 1873, of the first complete MS. of the *Didache*. He proceeds to discuss the manner (Prolegg. chapters iii. and iv. pp. 4—22), in which the *Didache* was used by the early Fathers; he cites in full the quotations from, and the references to, that book, which are found in the patristic literature of the first five centuries. He next examines the text of the original book, 'The Two Ways,' which appears similarly in the Ep. Barnab. (xviii.—xx.), the *Didache* (i.—vi.), the Ecclesiastical Canons, and the viith book of the Apostolical Constitutions (Prolegg. chapt. v. and vi. p. 23—36), and he concludes with an enquiry into the time and place, in which the *Didache* was written, the references which it contains to books of the New Testament, as well as the parallel passages in the Ep. Barnab., Eccles. Can., and Apostol. Constitut. (Prolegg. chap. vii.—xi. pp. 38—46).

The author has adopted the plan of placing immediately after the text of the *Didache* that of the Ecclesiastical Canons, the viith Book of the Apostol. Constitut., Ep. Barnabas (xviii.—xx.), as well as the Latin fragment, recently discovered, and containing the first two chapters of the *Didache*. The references in the text of the *Didache* to the Bible, as well as the references, which are found in the Ecclesiastical Canons and the other books, bearing on the *Didache*, are marked by different type, and render it easier to compare the several texts. The comments on the text of the *Didache* are very full; and at all the important passages the various explanations hitherto offered are taken into account. In several cases I am unable to accept the view which the author adopts. Chap. vi. 2 (p. 18, 19), εἰ δ' οὐ δύνασαι (scilic. βαστάσαι) ὅλον τὸν ζυγὸν τοῦ κυρίου) ὃ δύνη, τοῦτο ποιεῖ. Funk explains "ζυγός, ut connexus docet, praecepta significat, de quibus in parte antecedente sermo est," and he adds, "Auctor annuit, non omnia mandata . . . vere praecepta et omnino omnibus servanda esse." The preceding chapters, however, contain the 'way of life,' the moral laws; they are partly an enlargement of the Sermon on the Mount, the Decalogue, and the Prov. The last (the fifth chapter) speaks of the φόνοι, μοιχεῖαι, etc. . . . ρυσθίητε, τέκνα, ἀπὸ τούτων πάντων. Surely these are 'mandata omnibus servanda.' The ζυγός (Acts xv. 10; also Matt. xi. 29, 30) refers to a modified ceremonial law; this is rendered probable by the περὶ δὲ τῆς βρώσεως, which follows immediately. To chap. ix. 4, p. 26, τῆς ἀγίας ἀμπέλου Δαβὶδ, the parallels given are John xv. 1, and Matt. 26, 29. But I agree with C. Taylor that the origin of this simile must be traced in the ρίζα Δαβὶδ (Isaiah xi. 1, 10, and perhaps in Gen. xlix. 9—11). At any rate the remarkable explanation of Justin Martyr (Apol. i. 32) of those two passages should be quoted. In chap. xvi. 6, p. 48, there appears to be no reason to suspect a copyist's error—σημεῖον ἐκπετάσεως for σ. ἐπιφάσεως (= ἐπιφανείας), or to derive the word, as Bryennius does, from ἐκπέτομαι or ἐκπέταμαι (avolo). The true explanation may be possibly obtained from a comparison of Justin Dial. 317 D, 319 A. with Ep. Barnab. xii.: Moses was spreading (ἐκπετάσας) or stretching out his hands crosswise. The σημεῖον is, then, that of the cross, appearing in the heavens, one of 'the three signs,' which announce the advent of

Christ. The value of Funk's work is not so much in his having thrown fresh light on the hard sayings of the *Didache*, as in the fact that he has carefully collected the explanations hitherto offered, and has furnished the reader with all available material for the study of the book.—CHARLES MERK.

NEMESII EMESANI libri περι φύσεως ἀνθρώπου versio latina. E libr. ms. nunc primum edidit et apparatus critico instruxit CAROLUS HOLZINGER. Lipsiae, Freytag; Pragae, Tempsky. 1887. 8vo. pp. xl, 176. 6 Mk.

To Hermann Usener belongs the credit of suggesting the publication of this book, which gives a text founded on two MSS. (B. i.e. Bamberg, 67; P. i.e. Prague, Metropolitan Library, L 94, a transcript of B.) both of the thirteenth century. Both contain in addition, Sen. n. q. and the Asclepius.

P. has no title, but Usener from a short description recognised in it a Latin Nemesius, and informed the editor of the discovery of the other copy B. Seven chapters (35–38, 42–44) are wanting in both MSS., and the Greek order, after c. 19, is several times deserted.

The translation appears to be different from that ascribed to Joannes Burgundius, a jurisconsult and judge of Pisa († 1194). It is slavishly literal, retaining many Greek words in Latin characters. Often a Greek word has been confused with another of similar form; thus ἐσθής appears as *sensibilitas*, προσηκούσας as *obaudientes*, κῶνον as *pulverem*. Many interpolations and lacunae in the Greek text may be corrected by aid of the Latin. The spelling has been corrected throughout, the Greek terms set side by side with the Latin in the *apparatus criticus*; a Latin index of seven pages closes the book.

In the current number (xlii 2 p. 276–285) of the *Rheinisches Museum*, H. von Arnim prints in parallel columns parts of Nemes. de nat. hom. c. 3 and the Latin of Prisciani solutiones ad Chosroën (ed. Bywater, Suppl. Aristot. i 2 p. 558). The title of the article, Sources of the tradition respecting Ammonius Sakkas would not necessarily attract a student of Nemesius.—JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

Des hl. Johannes Chrysostomus De Sacerdotio libri sex. Mit Anmerkungen neu herausgegeben von Carl Seltmann, Domcapitular in Breslau. Mit Genehmigung des Fürstbischöflichen Ordinariats zu Breslau. Münster und Paderborn, 1887. 2 Mk. 50.

THE object of this edition is to supply a handy text of the *De Sacerdotio* with explanatory notes, to help theological students in the reopened seminaries to count the cost before entering upon the priesthood, and to help the clergy to fulfil the duties which they have undertaken. The book is well printed; and the notes, when they go beyond an alternative reading or the translation of a sentence, are mostly of a practical nature, giving examples out of the editor's own pastoral experience. They are moderate and sensible in tone.—A. P.

Essais de Métrique grecque, par A. E. CHAIGNET. Paris. 1887. 6 fr.

THE first part of this book (eighty pages) deals with the general principles of Greek metre, the second (pp. 81–265) is a study of the iambic metre in its various forms. There is also an appendix of a dozen pages on asynartete verses. M. Chaignet treats the subject from a purely metrical point of view. His

position is that the long syllable always = two short syllables; he does not admit that it ever = three short syllables or more, and is totally opposed to the rhythmical treatment of metre adopted e.g. by Westphal and Christ whom he constantly criticises. He does not, however, appear to contribute anything new of importance to the argument against the rhythmical doctrine. Moreover, there are serious defects in his book. (1) He does not distinguish the relative importance of the different writers on Greek metre and rhythm, e.g. sources of such different value as Aristoxenus, Hephaestion, and the various Scholia on Hephaestion. (2) The weakness of the metrical, and the strength of the rhythmical point of view cannot be seen without taking into account the entire range of Greek metres, lyrical as well as non-lyrical; the introduction on the general principles of Greek metre leaves the former too much out of sight, and the result is therefore misleading. (3) The book shows a want of accuracy, and contains a number of mistakes. The quotations are often given in a careless manner. Thus e.g. Marius Victorinus is quoted by the paging sometimes of Putschius, sometimes of Gaisford, and the change is made from one paging to another even within the limits of the same note, without any indication of the edition used. The quotations are not always correct, and the meaning is missed because the words are separated from their context. Thus the term ἐπιπλοκή is apparently applied (p. 39) to a verse in which all the feet are pure, e.g. all dactyls, or all iambs, though the Schol. on Hephaestion quoted in the note, when taken in connection with the context, shows that it means a union of different species of verse in one genus, e.g. of iambs and trochees in the ἐπιπλοκή τρίσημος. The term ἐπισύνθετον is applied (p. 68) to a verse in which are united κῶλα of different species, e.g. trochees and iambs, though the passage quoted from the Schol. to Hephaestion shows that it means a verse in which are united κῶλα of different genera, e.g. trochees and dactyls. In a book on metre mistakes in quantity are particularly out of place. Some of these are merely misprints, but this cannot be said of the following. The line λέοντες Ἕλληνας δύο διδύμω is quoted (p. 157), as an iambic trimeter brachycatalectic, and attention is called to the anapaest in the 4th foot. The line Διόνυσος δὲν τίκτει ποθ' ἢ Κάδμον κόρη is said (p. 181), to begin with a tribrach. The lines—

λευκίπποι ξυνομαίμονες ὤλβισαν ὤλβισαν
τὸ πρόσθ' ἐκ δόμων δ' ἐνόσφισαν θεοὶ σ' ἐμοῦ

are quoted (p. 158) as iambic trimeters catalectic! In his treatment of the iambic trimeter M. Chaignet advocates restoring to the Greek tragedians the anapaests in 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 5th feet which Porson expelled. He is more convincing in his argument against the symmetry which some scholars have fancied they discovered as a frequent element in the iambic trimeters of Greek tragedy. His criticism of Westphal's view that verses are asynartete if they have internal catalexis, shows that he does not altogether understand Westphal's meaning. His own conclusion is that asynartete verses are those in which the feet of the combined κῶλα differ from one another in genus or species ("il faut que les pieds qui composent la première série ne soient ni de même grandeur, ni surtout de même rythme que les pieds de la seconde, et qu'ils leur soient même contraires sous ce double rapport"). Both Westphal's view and M. Chaignet's involve difficulties. The latter has to exclude from the class of asynartetes some verses which are stated by Hephaestion or Scholia to be asynartete, and owing to a hasty reading of

Hephaestion attributes to him and adopts the incredible scansion of the asynartete line *ἔστι μοι καλὰ πᾶσι χρυσεόσιν ἀνθέμοισιν* as a combination of a dimeter trochaic acatalectic and an iambic hephthemimeris i.e. — — — — — — — — and — — — — — — — —. The book is disfigured by a large number of misprints.—C. B. HEBERDEN.

Carmina figurata Gracca, ed. CAROLUS HAEBERLIN.
Editio altera. Hannoverae. 1887. 3 Mk.

THIS is a very complete and careful edition of the six poems in the Greek Anthology which are composed in lines of varying length arranged so as to represent the profile of the subject of the poem. The book contains a revised text with an *apparatus criticus*, the Scholia, and Latin prolegomena. The latter (sixty-six pages) consist of an account of the MSS., a list of editions, a critical and partly exegetical commentary and a discussion of the date and authorship of the poems as well as the relations between them. The conclusion is that with the exception of the second *βωμός* they were written about 300—275 B.C., and that the traditional authorship is right, i.e. that the *πτέρυγες ἔρωτος*, the *πέλεκυς*, and the *φών* were composed by Simias, the first *βωμός* by Doriadas, and (contrary to the opinion of most editors), the *σῦριγξ* by Theocritus. In arguing for the authenticity of the latter poem the editor lays stress on the resemblance between the *σῦριγξ* and the 7th Idyll (*θαλύσσια*) of Theocritus, and makes some ingenious conjectures as to the persons introduced under fictitious names in that Idyll. He also, following Wilamowitz, points out imitations of Lycophron's *Alexandra* in the *βωμός* of Doriadas. The second *βωμός*, which is distinguished from the other *carmina figurata* by being in an Ionic (not Doric) dialect, he assigns to the time of Hadrian. Many of the suggestions made in this part of the prolegomena must be (to say the least) very uncertain, as the writer himself admits, but he seems to have done everything possible to throw light on these obscure metrical curiosities.—C. B. HEBERDEN.

Plautus Captivi. Recensuit F. SCHOELL. Leipzig, 1887. 8vo. (Teubner) xxii. and 136. 4 Mk.

SCHOLARS will be glad to welcome another instalment of this work, invaluable to students of Plautus and Old Latin in general. In the preface Professor Schoell touches on a number of various points. He banishes, it may be hoped for ever, the forms *Valeis*, *Valide*, &c., shewing that several of the passages where they have been introduced on metrical grounds require other more far-reaching remedies. He brings the authority of Artemidorus, *Onciroer*. I., 78, to prove that Ergasilus = *ἐργάσιμος* (*seortum*), and argues in support of the form *lorarius* which he has introduced from B, E, J into the headings of Acts I. and II., perhaps with doubtful wisdom. The *apparatus criticus*, which it is hardly necessary to say is given with the most minute accuracy, contains a complete account of the readings of the following MSS.—A, collated by Loewe, and afterwards a second time by Professor Schoell himself, B, D to v. 503, and E, all three times collated by Loewe, J, for which Prof. Sonnenschein's collation is used, and the Ottobonian fragment O, containing v. 400-555. The various emendations which have been suggested are not given with the *apparatus criticus*, but in the form of an *appendix critica* at the end of the volume. This was the method originally adopted in the edition of the *Trinummus*, and it seems unfortunate that it has not been followed throughout. The weak point of

the edition is perhaps the emendations. Prof. Schoell has introduced nearly 100 of his own of greater or less importance, and of these the most that can be said is that some of them may be right. One of those which seem most probable, is *Actoli illi* which he reads for the *Actoli* of the MSS. in vv. 24 and 93. We may mention among others v. 135, *Ossa atque pellis sum, miser, I macritudine*. The MSS. give here, *miseri amacritudine* B¹, *miser amacritudine* B², D, E, J; Nonius 136, 2, reads *miser macritudine* (*marcitudine* P¹). Plautus uses the phrase *longa littera* (I) to suggest *suspensio per collum*, much as Hood speaks of "enlisting in the line." Another sense of *I longum* may be found in Ausonius, Epigrams, 128, 11, but is there any instance in classical Latin where it is used to denote excessive leanness? Ussing reads *miser macritudine* with Nonius, and this may be right though it hardly accounts for the *miseria* and *miseria* of the Plautus MSS. Was the original reading *miser A! macritudine*? *A!* might fairly be supposed to represent the deep sigh uttered by the unhappy Ergasilus, as he reflects on the terrible state of emaciation to which he has been reduced by the capture of his commissariat department. If *A* had dropped out in the original of B as in Nonius, the *i* of B¹ may represent the sign of insertion, a common source of corruption in MSS. In v. 199, Prof. Schoell reads *Eam queit crili imperio ingeniis nostris lenem reddere*, introducing *queit* for *que et* of the MSS. How is *queit* to be construed? Immediately below, v. 201, where the MSS. are hopelessly corrupt, he gives *multabo bolis, oculos si multum raditis*. What are the *boli* (gains, catches) of which they are to be mulcted, and does the fact that the laws of the Twelve Tables forbid women *radere genas* (to tear their cheeks) in sign of mourning, justify the *lorarius* in telling the captives that he will mulct them of their gains if they tear their eyes to any great extent (*multum*)? v. 212 he reads *acquiter* which Priscian mentions as used by Plautus in the sense of *aeque*. Is there any authority for the use of *aeque* in the positive, meaning 'fairly' or 'equitably'?

In v. 690 he reads *qui per uirtutem perit ablit non interit*. All the MSS. of Plautus give *peritat non interit*. The reading *ablit* seems to have been suggested by Nonius 422, 7, where the second hand of the Leyden MS. (L), with the Paris MSS. C and D, and the Montpellier MS. read, *perit aut*; as also, I believe, the Wolfenbüttel MS. It must however be remembered that the Harleian, Leyden first hand, and Paris P agree in giving *at*, and the united testimony of these three MSS. is not to be lightly set aside. In Nonius MSS. too *aut* is much

more likely to be a corruption of *at*, arising from *ut* (*at* corrupted to *ut* and corrected) than *vice versa*. Perhaps a better suggestion may be *Qui per uirtutem perit, perit at non interit*, proposed by Gertz. In support of this reading the following considerations may be urged, (1) That it is nearer the MSS. both of Plautus and Nonius. (2) That Nonius is distinguishing between *perire* and *interire*, not between *abire* and *interire*, as the reading *ablit* would seem to require. (3) In v. 693, Hegio replies *Vel te interiisse uel periisse praedicent*, not *uel abiisse*, and *periisse* in 693 seems to presuppose *perit* in 690. It should be mentioned that both these readings have already been suggested by English scholars, *ablit* by Prof. Nettleship, *perit* by Prof. Palmer of Dublin.

The list might be considerably extended, but it is an ungrateful task to criticise individual details in a work of this importance, which the *apparatus criticus* alone must render indispensable.—J. H. ONIONS.

Plautus, Rudens, recensuit F. SCHOELL. Teubner. 1887 (xxvi and 188). 5 Mk. 60.

PROFESSOR SCHOELL has succeeded in publishing two plays of this edition within the space of twelve months, a feat on which he will receive the thanks and congratulations of all Latin scholars. The plan of the work is the same as that adopted in the *Trinummus* and *Captivi*, the *apparatus criticus* being placed under the text, while the *variae lectiones* are added at the end of the volume in the form of an *appendix critica*. All that need be said about them is that they are, if possible, even fuller and more complete than in the preceding plays. The *appendix critica* seems really to omit nothing, as far at any rate as the works of German scholars are concerned, giving the latest results of German criticism down to the middle of the present year. In the preface Professor Schoell gives a short account of the materials at his disposal for the formation of the text, which comprise the following: B and C collated by Ritschl, and since by Loewe and Professor Schoell himself, D collated by Loewe and Professor Schoell, and F collated by Professor Schoell alone. There are also twelve leaves of A, of which seven had previously been examined by Ritschl and Geppert, and have now been re-examined by Professor Schoell. The remaining five, at present uncollated, are in a very damaged condition, but Professor Schoell hopes that, in another visit to the Ambrosian Library, he may by careful examination succeed in deciphering something of value. The author shews in an elaborate argument that the archetype of all the existing MSS. was damaged in many places, and accounts for the omission of initial and final words, in verses occurring at intervals of twenty lines, on the theory that the common archetype contained twenty lines to a page. He further discusses the much-vexed question as to the meaning of line 86; *non uentus fuit uerum Alcmena Euripidi*, entering the lists against the generally received view, that the reference is to a terrible storm occurring in the *Alcmena*. Professor Schoell argues on the strength of a quotation from Eupolis, in Bekker's *Anecdota*, 401, 8, that in the Greek original the *ἀνεμος* referred not to an actual wind, but to a person changeable as the wind. The verse would then mean, not a mere wind in fickleness, but an—Euripides' *Alcmena*. *Iudicium habemus non infacetum sed frigidiusculum de Euripide mulierem infidelem detrectante* says Professor Schoell, and perhaps his own criticism may not unfairly be applied to his own explanation. As might be expected in the case of so corrupt a play, Professor Schoell has introduced a large body of conjectural emendations. Of these most are possible, many probable, some no doubt will generally be accepted. In some cases however Professor Schoell seems to reject satisfactory emendations already made, in favour of new and less probable conjectures of his own, and occasionally to alter the MSS. reading where a change is unnecessary or even injurious to the sense. As instances may be cited *inter alia*: v. 7 *Ambulo in terra dius* S, *interdius* MSS. Spengel's *hic interdius* makes excellent sense, and seems altogether preferable, as *in terra* is very awkward before *ad terram* in the next line. v. 39 *Huic filiola ultro* S, *ultro* om. MSS. *Huic filiola olim* Reize. Professor Schoell rejects *olim*, but it surely improves the sense, as the girl was only *trima* when lost and was now grown up. v. 77 *Ad uillam uiuas* S, *illius* MSS. *Viuas* can hardly stand in this emphatic position. There is no point in laying stress on the fact that they were washed ashore alive, as though they might have been expected to be dead. Is it not more probable that we have here a trace of a dittography of this line? It may be mentioned that the next line is bracketed by

Professor Schoell. v. 161, *Qui aerumnas herculeae socius esse diceris* S, *Qui hercule socius* C D, *q. herculis* s. B? Would not this reading require a further change of *esse* to *fuisse*? v. 210 *nec dius hic fui* S, *diu* MSS. *Dius* he proposes to translate 'meines Tages' (in all my born days), urging that *in actate* is used in this sense? But is *in diebus*? v. 304, *in caeno sumus profecto* S, *incentati sumus* MSS. Hermann's *cenati sumus* (we've had all the supper we're likely to get), seems better in every way. *Cenati* would be altered to *incentati*, to correspond with *incentati* in v. 302, by a scribe who missed the point of the remark. v. 385. *Fur facile quom hanc seruat uidet* S, *quem obseruat* MSS. which is surely preferable to Professor Schoell's correction. The point of the passage is this: The thief has a great advantage over the watcher. He knows the man he has to watch, the watcher doesn't. v. 411. *Ut capse succincta adiunat calefactat* S, *aquam* for *adiunat* MSS. *Calefactat* alone without an object is at any rate unusual. Has *aquam* taken the place of *alucum*? v. 418 *nam nunc nihil est qui te inanem ceferciam* S, *ceferciam* om. MSS. *manem* C D, *inanem* B. Lambinus read 'e suis libris' *mane mulierem*, the verb to be supplied being left to the audience. Professor Schoell objects to *mane* as unnecessary after *nunc*, but *nunc mane* corresponds excellently well to *mox uesper* in the previous line. v. 468. *Commodule melli's* S, *melius* MSS. *Melli's* seems rather out of place at this point of the soliloquy. Sceparnio is first tender, then serious, then angry. He is now passing into the serious stage. The Greek μέλλεις corresponds fairly closely to *melius*, and gives a satisfactory sense: 'You're keeping me waiting here a pretty time.' v. 494. *Utinam te, pus, prius quam oculis uidissem meis* S, *pus* om. MSS. Guyet's *Utinam prius te quam* should be certain. It may be noticed that *prius* is similarly transposed in v. 455. v. 538 L. *Qui?* Ch. *Quia id auderem* S, *id* om. MSS. *qui auderem* A. It is very difficult to see why *quia* should take the subjunctive here. Is it not safer to adopt *qui auderem* from A, and read, L. *Qui?* Ch. *Qui?* *Qui auderem*, comparing Ter. Andr. 502. v. 636. *Ut tibi ulmcam ni metere speras uirgidemiam* S, where instead of *ni metere* the MSS. have, *ubire* *ce* B, *uberem esse* C D F. Prof. Schoell's correction surely greatly weakens the comic effect of the passage. Trachalio has just said, I beg and beseech you, as you hope for a good harvest of your usual crop the *laserpicium*. To this Daemones replies, and I adjure you, as you hope for a good harvest of your usual crop—the birch. Lomann's *futuram* gives the kind of sense required, but is rather weak and also wide of the MSS. Starting from *ubire ce*, of which *uberem esse* is no doubt a correction, I would suggest *uirere*. *Ubire ce* would arise from *uirere* corrupted to *birere* and corrected. So in Martial xi. 106. 1, two of the best MSS. (P and Q) have *habuere* for *hauere*, the other MSS. *habere*. v. 684. *malefacere lenonem in me* S, *malefacere* om. MSS. I would rather suggest *uim adferre* as in v. 729, cf. also v. 680, 690 &c. v. 692. *moeniam manu: hinc ego defensabo* S, —*moenia hinc* B C D, *ego uos* B, *uos* om. C D, *moenia haec: hinc ego uos* Lambinus and others, which appears more probable. v. 752 *contende ergo uter sit tergo uerior* S. with the MSS. *Tergo uerior* is however quite impossible Latin. The sense required by the context seems to be, then let the state of our backs decide which of us is better at speaking the truth; and this sense may be obtained by the slight change, *contende ergo terga uter sit uerior*, then compare our backs to see which &c. v. 918. *Paupertatem eri qui et meam sentilentam* S, *sententiam* MSS. For this use of *sentilentam* Prof. Schoell compares Capt. 185, where however the metaphor is

helped by a play on the meaning of the word. The sense seems to require here some substantive, meaning hunger e.g. *ieiunitatem*. 1093. *Viden scelestus ut palpatur* S, *scelestus us* (or *is*) *aucupatur* MSS. *Palpatur* is wide of the MSS. and can hardly be right as Trachalio uses no *palpatio* whatsoever. Studemund's *Viden scelestum ut aucupatur* is more probable, though *aucupatur* again is open to the objection that Trachalio's speech is in no sense an *aucupatio*. I would suggest *auguratur*, making the word refer to *suspicio* and *de opinione*, expressions which Trachalio has just used. So v. 986. Gripus accosts Trachalio as *philosophe*. v. 1124. *Vidi petere miluom etiam coruom: nihil auferet tamen* S, *cum* (for *coruom*) MSS. *auferret* D F, *auferet* C, *aufer* B. Surely *coruom* seriously weakens the point of the passage, and is much inferior to the old reading *cum nihil auferret tamen*. Gripus says 'You were for pouncing on the half.' Trachalio replies 'Yes and I still am.' To which Gripus rejoins 'I've seen a kite pounce and . . . get nothing.' v. 1138. D. *Ius merum oras meo quidem animo*. G. *At meo hercle malitias mera* S, *malitias mera om*. MSS. It seems very strange that Prof. Schoell should not adopt the obvious correction *iniuriam meram*, which has been repeatedly suggested by scholar after scholar. v. 1152. P. *Ius bonum oras*. G. *Edopol haud recte orat: nam tu iniuria's* S, *te* MSS. for *recte*, and this is surely *Plautinissimum*, 'If he's asking what's fair, he's not asking you, for you're unfair.' v. 1169. *Postid ensicula* S, *Postin sicula* C D, *post in sicilicula* B. *Ensicula* can hardly stand, as it is highly improbable that the *vidulus* contained an *ensicula* as well as an *ensiculus*. v. 1232. *Tanto immo melior: obtigit qui perdidit* S, *Tanto melius illi*. MSS. *Tanto illi melius* (Bentley) is much nearer the MSS. and seems to give a more pointed sense, 'Then so much the better for the man who—lost it.' v. 1307. *in mari pecu alui* S, *mari et alii* MSS. *Pecu alui* is surely impossible. Labrax has not fed the fishes in the only sense possible here. (Like Sir Thomas in the Ingoldsby Legends). v. 1170. *Etsuculast*. G. *Quin tu i dierecta* S. Prof. Schoell scans *dierecta* as a trisyllable, but does not mention Prof. Nettleship's view as to the origin of the word. On the whole it is perhaps no '*iniqua censura*' to say that in Prof. Schoell the man has rather a tendency to disappear in the scholar. But let us be thankful for his scholarship, and indefatigable and painstaking industry, and wish him health and leisure to publish the remaining plays with even greater rapidity.

J. H. ONIONS.

1. *M. Tullii Ciceronis de Oratore Liber Primus: für den Schulgebrauch erklärt* von Prof. Dr. REMIGIUS STÖBILE. 1 Bandchen. Gotha, F. A. Perthes, 1887. 1 Mk. 30.
2. *M. Tullii Cicerone dell' Oratore Libri tre: testo riveduto ed annotato da Antonio Cima*. Torino, Loescher, 1887. 2 l. 50.

BOTH these editions of Cicero de Oratore are intended for school use. The text of the former has been settled by Dr. Stangl, and so has no independent critical value. It represents the *ad interim* judgment of a scholar who has already done excellent work on the rhetorical works of Cicero, and whose own edition is looked forward to with high anticipations. Unfortunately it comes to us entirely without critical notes of any kind or form. It is impossible to ascertain what are the grounds on which Dr. Stangl has accepted a reading, except where it happens to have been discussed by him in one of his scattered papers and essays, or why he has, as is sometimes the case, retracted a judgment

previously expressed. It is a great step backwards for Dr. Stangl to have taken after his excellent editions of the Orator and the Brutus; and we can only hope that the edition which he promises to give on the same model as these, will not be long delayed. Dr. Stöbile's notes are well adapted to their purpose: they are not so full of instruction as to the syntax and idiom of Cicero as those of Dr. Sorof, and the editor appears to have avoided of set purpose all illustrations from parallel passages; but the translations of individual words and phrases are numerous and generally accurate, and the student has what is needful for the understanding of the text given to him in a very brief and clear form. An English schoolmaster would probably not care to have his boys saved so entirely the trouble of using a classical dictionary; but the boys would find the notes just what they liked. In a work presenting so many difficulties there are of course cases where Dr. Stöbile has decided one way, when the balance of evidence to others would appear to incline the other way, and to speak with a confidence which is not altogether warranted; but the appearance of dogmatism is inevitable in notes of this compass, and he will generally be found a safe and sensible guide.

The edition of Signor Cima furnishes a somewhat more thorough commentary than that of Dr. Stöbile, and especially, in an appendix of 17 pages, it gives an excellent critical commentary, like that of Sorof, with all important variations of the MSS. and of the best recent editions. This is also indebted to Dr. Stangl for the readings of his important Italian MSS. The language of the explanatory notes will, of course, be a bar to the use of this edition in English schools; and these do not claim to have much independent value. They are largely selected from previous commentators, as a rule, with very good judgment: but I have not observed any fresh light thrown upon any obscure passage. The most interesting portion is to be found in the frequent distinctions drawn between the Latin words and phrases and the derived Italian ones. But if the edition does not add much to our knowledge, it is to be welcomed as a sign of the thoroughness of the teaching of Latin in Italian schools, and the acquaintance of Italian scholars with the most recent German and English works.—A. S. W.

Ueber die Appendix Vergiliana. By MAX SONNTAG.

THE most noticeable feature of this programme is the view taken by Sonntag of the epigram *Quis deus, Octavi, te nobis abstulit? an quid dicunt* &c. He accepts the heading of the *Culex* in the codex Thuanicus *Poetarum sapientissimi P. Vergilii Maronis condiscipuli Octavianus Caesaris Augusti mundi imperatoris iuuenalis ludi libellus incipit* as conveying a fact, Octavianus and Vergil had been *condiscipuli*. The epigram was written by the poet to the future master of the Roman world shortly after the battle of Philippi, when, whilst on his return to Italy, he was attacked by sickness and was reported dead, (Dion. C. 48, 3, 1). The poem would belong therefore to the spring of B.C. 41. The distich

Scripta quidem tua nos multum mirabimur, et te
Raptum et Romanam flebimus historiam.
Sed tu nullus eris. Perversi dicite Manes,
Hunc super esse patri quae fuit invidia?

refers to writings by Octavius with which Virgil was presumably acquainted as fellow-pupil of the rhetor Epidius; Suetonius (*Aug.* 85) tells us *multa varii generis in prosa oratione composuit, ex quibus nonnulla*

in coetu familiarium recitavit; and speaks of his practising oratory and composition with assiduity from his earliest years. The words *Romanam flebimus historiam* Sonntag would explain not of actual historical works written by Octavius (though he left some), but of the loss of a central figure in the history of the time which his death would effect. The words *super esse patri* would have a natural meaning as referring to Octavius' death within three years from that of his adoptive father J. Caesar.

It is not impossible that this is an old view revived. It certainly deserves attention. The rest of the pamphlet is not worth much. In particular I dissent strongly from Sonntag's disparagement of the graceful epigram *Si mihi susceptum fuerit decurrere munus*, which, with Niebuhr, I have always thought quite worthy of Vergil.—ROBINSON ELLIS.

Étude sur Quinte Curce, sa vie et son œuvre, par S. DOSSON, Professeur à la faculté des lettres de Clermont-Ferrand, &c. Paris: Hachette and Co. 1887. 9 fr.

THIS is an admirable work: learned, well arranged, clearly argued, complete. To read it would be an unmixed pleasure, if one could turn aside at will to follow up the side-paths of inquiry everywhere suggested by its fruitful pages.

The first part is devoted to preliminary discussions. The apocryphal theory is dismissed, and the authenticity of the *History of Alexander* is established, in a neat and judicious criticism. The date of the work, long a vexed question among scholars, is discussed with enviable fulness and lucidity: M. Dosson arrives at the same conclusion as Müttzell, Vogel and Teuffel, that it belongs to the early years of Claudius; and I can hardly believe that this conclusion will ever be shaken. At the same time it seems to me that it might be quite as strong if some of the evidence were less confidently pressed. Next an attempt is made to determine the identity of the author. Here a probable conjecture is all that can be attained. M. Dosson with great probability identifies the author with the Curtius Rufus spoken of by Tacitus and the younger Pliny. This I have always thought a very reasonable view; but why it should be so unreasonable (see p. 49) to hold that the rhetorician named by Suetonius may also be the same person, I cannot as yet see. It is a further conjecture, no doubt, and devoid of evidence strictly so called: but so is the other identification, and in neither case is there, so far as I can see, any serious objection to the conjecture, provided we understand that it is a conjecture and no more. The Professor proceeds to show how natural it was for a *Life of Alexander* to appear in the Rome of the first century A.D.

The second part, headed 'Quinte Curce historien,' opens with a treatise of the various materials existing in Curtius' time for a history of Alexander. These are shown to have been very plentiful and of various kinds; and then comes what is perhaps the most important section of the work, the inquiry into the materials actually employed by Curtius, the proportions in which they are severally used, and the methods followed by him in their use. To attempt any detailed criticism of this inquiry is out of the question here, nor do I feel competent to the task; but I will say that I believe the results on the whole to be correct and arrived at by legitimate processes. I must however remark that in this part of the work also I doubt whether M. Dosson is not at times too confidently definite in his conclusions, whether he does not expect from his method more than it is capable of yielding. Many points turn up in the

course of the book to minimise this feeling of doubt: but I confess that, though weakened, it still remains.

The third part contains an inquiry into the character of Curtius' talent. Chapters 1—3 'Q. C. peintre, orateur, moraliste' are brilliant, descriptive and critical essays, thorough and clear-sighted and in the very best style of French elegance and brightness. For scholars' reading it would perhaps be better if passages were more freely quoted in the original, and printed in parallel columns, as is done in the second part. The fault of the work in fact is that it is rather too neat; for I cannot imagine that it is in any case meant for the 'general reader.' But the scholarship is there sure enough; and such masterly handling of great masses of material, admirably selected and grouped, is seldom seen: I know of nothing in English to equal it save the writings of Professor Sellar. Chapter 4 'Q. C. écrivain' is also an excellent piece of work, but in § 1 (language) the need of frequent and tabulated quotations is very perceptible. Of this part of the book I may say in general that the analysis of the influences of the conditions of Roman life in the Claudian period, of the rhetorical schools, of the contemporary philosophy, of the recitations and of education and habits generally, on the writers of the time, their canons of composition, their tone of thought, and their mannerisms of style and diction, is in the highest degree fruitful and suggestive. The results of the whole inquiry are summed up in a clear and judicious chapter with which the main body of the work appropriately ends. M. Dosson remarks with truth that if Livy is to be styled the Vergil of history, Quintus Curtius may be called its Lucan. Indeed the affinity, not less striking than the difference, between Curtius and Lucan, has been often present to my mind: and I believe that there is room for an interesting dissertation on this subject.

M. Dosson concludes his labours with two extremely valuable and learned appendices; the first containing an exhaustive account of the MSS. of Curtius, the second a dissertation on the traces of Curtius in ancient writers, his complete disappearance for several centuries, his reappearance and the diffusion of his work in the Middle Ages. To so voluminous and learned a book on a special subject a copious index would have been a welcome addition. The 'table des matières' at the end is a poor substitute for such.

In reading this excellent treatise one cannot but feel how much English scholarship suffers from the paucity of similar works among ourselves. The true value of the study of literature cannot be fully known till it is seriously and methodically established by a combination of critical lucidity and sound learning, such as we find in the 'Q. Curce' of Professor Dosson.

W. E. HEITLAND.

Verrianische Forschungen, von R. REITZENSTEIN. Breslau Philologische Abhandlungen, Vol. 1., Heft 4. Breslau, Koebner, 1887. 116 pp. 2 Mk. 40.

THIS essay, which students of ancient Latin scholarship will find very serviceable, consists of five chapters and a few excursuses. In the first chapter Dr. Reitzenstein undertakes to refute the theory of Müller, Gruppe, and Hoffmann, that the last or second parts of each book or letter¹ in Paulus and Festus were added by Festus to the original work of

¹ Müller observed that in the first part of each book there is a tendency to regard not only the first but the second letter of each word; in the second it is not so.

Verrius, whether from materials supplied by Festus himself or by other works of Verrius. The argument of chapter II. is that the single glosses often give indications of having been extracted in groups from the same works, and afterwards distributed among the various letters; thus (as Hertz pointed out) many of the glosses on proverbs may have come from Sennius Capito: the continuous glosses on names (e.g., *Caeso, Caesar*, p. 57; *Lucius, Lycius, Luceres, Lucani*, p. 119; *Opiter, Opitulus, Opitulata*, p. 170; *Mamercus, Mamurius, Mamers, Martialis, Mamilia turris*, p. 130) may in like manner go back to some one authority, perhaps Varro. The same reasoning holds good with regard to the groups of glosses which illustrate points of antiquities. Again, the same notes often occur under different glosses, probably from the conscious effort of Verrius to spare his readers trouble.

The same correspondence between groups of glosses under different letters may, it is argued in the third chapter, be observed in the second parts of some letters. And some of the series of glosses on Cato and Plautus may be analysed into smaller groups.

The fourth chapter contains an attempt to prove that the alphabetical order originally contemplated by Verrius in each letter had been disturbed, not probably by Festus, but through an early confusion in the redaction of the book by Verrius himself.

In chapter V., Dr. Reitzenstein mentions a number of the most important authorities which it is probable that Verrius used at first hand.

The aim of the whole essay is to show the homogeneousness of the work abridged by Festus, and the improbability of the hypothesis that this very poor scholar made any additions to the work of Verrius. With out entering into details we may say at once that in our opinion Dr. Reitzenstein has succeeded, especially by the close reasoning in Chapter I., in raising a strong presumption in favour of his view, though proof is perhaps not attainable.

Dr. Reitzenstein is also, we think, quite successful in demonstrating the existence of homogeneous groups of glosses under different letters, and right in referring them respectively to the same authorities.

The analysis of Catonian and Plautine glosses into smaller groups was undertaken at the suggestion of Studemund. It appears to us to rest on a more shadowy foundation than, no doubt, Dr. Reitzenstein would admit. His case is far the strongest in the case of the Plautine glosses, but even here the evidence is not conclusive. The point which he tries to make is this: that under the letter *C* (Paulus, p. 60-62), we find three groups of Plautine glosses, in which the plays are respectively quoted in alphabetical order, (1) *Curionem—Crumena*: from *Aulularia, Amphitruo, Bacchides*—(twice), uncertain plays; (2) *Corinthienses—Celassis*: from *Aulularia, Amphitruo, Bacchides, Casina* (thrice), *Cistellaria, Miles* (four times), *Stichus*; (3) *Custoditio—Culerc*: uncertain except in one instance. And corresponding to the second series under *C* is a series under *A* (*Abacint—aucta*): from *Aulularia, Casina, Miles, Menacchmi, Poenulus, Rudens, Trinummus*.

After the letter *C* Dr. Reitzenstein admits that the smaller groups of Plautine glosses quite vanish. But even under *A* and *C* he is obliged to make some assumptions which (is it owing to English "beef-mindedness"?) we are unable to accept. To make the gloss *Corinthienses* refer to the *Aulularia*, (559 *Corinthiensem fontem*), our author says it is impossible that Plautus can ever have used *Corinthienses* for the inhabitants of Corinth. Now *Atheniensis* is common instead of *Athenicus*; may not *Corinthiensis* have been used in

the same way by Plautus for *Corinthius*? If so, there is no necessity to think of the *Aulularia* here. *Conivolis* is referred to the lost part of the *Cistellaria* on hardly any evidence. *Cogitativ*, we are asked to believe, must have come out of the *Miles*, though it is not given in the MSS. either there or anywhere else in the remains of Plautus. *Clientam*, again, must come from the *Miles*, though, it might, on our author's own showing, come equally well from the *Poenulus* or the *Rudens*. *Capulum* must again refer to the *Miles*, because Nonius refers to *capularis* in this play in his gloss on *Capulum*. But *Capulum* might be a gloss on Lucretius's *ire ad capulum*. In his remarks on the Plautine series under *A*, Dr. Reitzenstein assigns *audilavi* on a conjecture of Bergk's to *Miles* 211, though it actually occurs *Stichus* 167. He then asserts that Paulus's words (p. 28), '*advelitatio*' *iactatio quaedam verborum figurata ab hastis velitaribus*, refer "zweifellos" to *Rudens* 525, *equidem me ad velitationem exerceo*. True, Turnebus thought this was possible. But Dr. Reitzenstein can hardly mean that Verrius took *advelitationem* as one word. If Verrius read *velitationem*, then the gloss has been transferred by an error from *V* to *A*, (for *me advelitationem exerceo* is untranslatable), and nothing is proved for the letter *A*. If the passage in the *Rudens* is referred to, *advelitatione* must be read (against the authority of *A* and *B*) in the text of Plautus. This was recognised by Turnebus. The gloss *auctor* feminine, it is assumed, refers to *Trin.* 107, or *Stichus* 129. It may equally well be meant for Vergil's *auctor ego audendi*, which is a stock quotation in the grammarians for the feminine use of *auctor*. The first point in dealing with Paulus is to remember, not only that he is a worse epitomist of a bad epitomist, but also that whole masses of Latin prose and poetry have perished.

In all this, as indeed in other parts of the book, we think Dr. Reitzenstein far too much inclined to mistake mere presumptions for certainties. This fault is conspicuous in the fourth chapter, which is a mere attempt to prove what cannot either be proved or disproved. We miss, by the bye, any mention either in this chapter or elsewhere of Verrius's original division of each letter into *libri*. The destruction of this arrangement by Festus is, no doubt, responsible for much of the obscurity which besets the whole subject.—H. NETTLESHIP.

Mélanges Renier. Recueil de travaux publiés par l'École Pratique des Hautes Études (Section des sciences historiques et philologiques) en mémoire de son président Léon Renier. Paris, Vieweg. 1887. pp. lx, 468. 15 fr.

THIS memorial volume opens with a short sketch of Renier by Desjardins, which is followed by a full bibliography under the three headings of *Livres Classiques*, *Travaux de Vulgarisation*, and *Travaux d'Érudition*. Under the last head Renier's works and occasional writings on epigraphical subjects are carefully detailed. The essays themselves are the work of some thirty different scholars. Those on classical subjects comprise the following topics: 1. The author of *c. Aristogit. I* and his acquaintance with Athenian institutions, by H. Weil. (Weil questions the ignorance imputed to the writer of this speech by J. H. Lipsius, *Leipziger Studien*, 1883). 2. Observations on the Text of the *Œconomicus*, by Ed. Tournier. (A number of emendations, some of them of a very drastic character and making seemingly too little allowance for free and even loose writing, the former intentional the latter unin-

tentional, in Xenophon's dialogue. Tournier acts up to a maxim for which he thinks a good deal could be said: 'n'essayez pas de corriger un passage avant de vous être assuré qu'il ne doit pas être supprimé.' 3. Whether the teaching of Pythagoras contained Egyptian elements? By F. Robiou. (A mild affirmative is supported by reference to ancient Egyptian records). 4. Remarks on the Attraction of the Demonstrative and Relative in Latin, by O. Riemann. (Supplementary and corrective of Madvig and Draeger). 5. VE in Greek, by L. Havet. (F', = *va* in the sense of 'as,' is assumed to have dropped out in Homer where the metre suggests the loss of a consonant before *ws*). 6. Commodianus, by G. Boissier. (An interesting account of the early Christian poet based on recent research. 7. Athenaeus and Lucian, by J. Nicole. (An ingenious attempt to fix the relative date of these authors by the examination of a passage in which Lucian apparently ridicules Athenaeus' blunder in giving Σκύφος as the nickname of Dereyllidas instead of Σίσυφος which Ephorus doubtless had). In the other classical articles, Chatelain directs attention to important manuscript authority for Virgil to be found in the *Bibliothèque Nationale* and Alfred Jacob gives a description of some Greek palimpsests (originally containing ecclesiastical matter, such as homilies, lectionaries, parts of Basil, Chrysostom, the *Scala Paradisi*) in the same library, while Haussoullier writes on the three Doric tribes in Crete. The remaining papers range from Semitic Notes to the Spaneas and from Pirro Ligorio to the Persian Apocalypse of Daniel.—W. RHYS ROBERTS.

Latin Examination Papers in Miscellaneous Grammar and Idioms. A. M. M. STEDMAN. Bell. 2s. 6d.

THIS collection of 'Grammar and Critical' papers does not of course profess or desire to be original,

but it is one of the useful labour-saving devices which have recently cropped up, as the production of schoolbooks has become more organised. The papers themselves, like most others, contain good, bad, and indifferent questions: but the large number, 133, which Mr. Stedman has collected gives quite sufficient choice to make the book most welcome. The hour spent in making a grammar paper is perhaps as well spent as any other devoted to needful drudgery: but there is no reason why so many people should spend it so often. With Mr. Stedman's help a good grammar paper can be set in ten minutes: and for this he will get abundant gratitude in the right quarter.—A. S.

Extracts for Translation. Selected by R. C. JEBB, H. JACKSON, and W. E. CURREY. Bell. 4s. 6d.

THE versions of these pieces were published some years ago by the three excellent scholars whose names they bear, and are well-known among teachers. They are so good, and so useful, that we have often been surprised that they have so few competitors.

Schoolmasters and other teachers will be glad to know that the originals are now thus conveniently collected in one volume, which can be used in class, and will save time in the study.

We only regret that the 'composition' pieces are so comparatively few. They are all good: and Professor Jebb is far and away the most brilliant composer in Greek and Latin now living.

The book has an interest for old Cambridge men, it may not be impertinent to add, as a record of the time when the colleges awoke to the scandal of having nearly all the best teaching done by private coaches. No one did more at Trinity College to remove this abuse than Mr. Jebb, Mr. Jackson, and Mr. Currey.—A.S.

DEDICATION.

(From the forthcoming "*Echoes of Hellas*.")

Ὡς τόδε σοί, δέσποινα καλῶν ἐπιήραν' Ἀθηνῶν,
μνήμ' ἀνέθηκα τεῆς Ἀθίδος οἰχομένης,
ἀσπάσιοι Φιδηλίδ', ἐμὸν φάος· ἥσπερ ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ
αἰδῶς τ' ἀτρεκίῃ τ' ὄμμασιν ἐνδιάει.
ἰμερτὸν δὲ μάλ' ἡμετέραις ἐν Ὀμηρίσιν ἦδεν
ὄψ' ἐ χορευούσαις· καὶ σὺ παρήσῃσα, θεά·
οἶά γ' Ὀμηρίσειν σπουδάσομεν, οὐδένες ὄντες,
φάσμασι ποιντοῖς φάσματα τῶν φθιμένων
βαῖὸν ἔτ' ἀγκάλεσαι χρίζοντες, ἵγγι ποθεινῆς
Ἑλλάδος, οἷς ἔμπης ἡχόα θέσπιν ἔχει.

G. C. WARR.

SUPPLEMENTUM TO PLAUTUS' *AULULARIA*, WRITTEN ON THE OCCASION OF THE PERFORMANCE BY THE STUDENTS OF TRINITY COLLEGE, MELBOURNE. APRIL 21, 1887.

By T. G. TUCKER.

sed quam ob rem studes tu reddere tam studiose
aurum seni ?
L. iure iurando promisi ita facere.
at et iuravi ego
numquam quoquam me ullo pacto id redditurum;
atque Herculi
voto dedicavi inventi partem nescio quam mei.
L. iurastine id? peierabis ergo hodie.
haud istuc meumst.
L. nam tibi, credo, primum in vita et unum erit
hoc periurium.
sed volo scire hoc tandem; das an non das? nam
seito probe,
ni, quam habes aulam, iam actutum et sine mora
abs te accepero,
sine mora ted ipsum exemplis accipiam miserru-
mis.
em: nimis fortiter isti pugni pugnant in scapulas
meas.
tene tu, tene: morem mi gerere potius quam
plagas placet.
do manus.
L. immo edepol aulam da.
dabo, atque adeo integram,
haec tamen una lege, ut liceat rem agere quo
velim modo.
nam expeditum crimine omni me cupio ipsum.
scilicet.
L. quid si ita aurum incolume reddam, ut me
incolumem reddam simul?
L. ita licet. sed quomodo, quaeso, fiet id?
nondum scio.
nisi quaedam iam in mentem venit semita—
ad malam cruceem.
sed quid ais? quid dare tu spondes, si dedero
suom seni
aurum, et post si fecero ut tibi rursus is dederit
lubens
simul et aurum et gnatum?
nugas loquere nugacissimas.
nam daret ille dentes oculos ossa, priusquam
aurum daret.
itaque fac ut se cedentandum cedorsuandum det
lubens.
han temere est quod disciplinam subii omnem
fallaciae.
sed quid das, si factum id dedero re, quod verbis
recipio?
quid lubet: vel libertatem.
vin' istuc stipularier?
quidni?
conceptisne verbis spondes ergo?
spondeo.
heus, vigilate, astutiae omnes. expergiscere,
cor meum.
pectoris eunctum senatum in curiam cito convoca,
ut hodie nascatur aliqua invieta sycophantia.
cedodum, quid facturus tandem?
iuxta tecum nescio.
sed animum advorte, et hoc ut memineris face.
quoque videbis me hodie ornatum incedere
ornatu, tace tu, neque me quis siem indica,
neque noveris me magis quam novisti bonam
frugem—tibi quicum nil commercii unquam
fuit.
L. nempe vorsa pelle huic usus est negotio;
cave vortas mox in varietatem virgulis.

s. pol istuc, Strobile, non male commentu's
quidem.
placet admodum istuc: magis magisque etiam
placet.
L. quid tecum loquere?
s. consilium primum,
lepidarum quantumst techinarum lepidissumam.
L. vin' participare me quod habes?
s. euge! hoc die
ego liber abibo: di me servatum volunt.
L. quid habes?
s. novistine homines nugatorios
istos, qui sese profitentur hariosos
vates sortilegos fatidicos haruspices,
quibus nusquam quicquamst quod nequeant
praedicere,
qui quae fuerunt quae sunt quae futura sunt
ea cuncta norunt? illum ornabo me in modum
illudque ad exemplum me geram compsissume.
tu noveris me; dissimulabis: hoc ages,
ut operam docte des meis doctis dolis.
abeo paratum. numquid vis? iam ego hic ero.

ACTUS V.

SCENA I.

EUCLIO. LYCONIDES.

E. occidi funditus atque exradicatus sum.
satin' ut elusit hunc hominem et in miserias
ultimas adtulit pessuma fortuna? vae,
maceror, disruior. filiam perdidit,
perdidi aulam meam. di deaque, obsecro,
facite ut, qui fecit haec, is modis omnibus
pessum eat. vae mihi, corruptit filiam
adulescens; aulam fur surpuit: nescio
quo me vortam aut qua infelici me suspendam
ex arbore.
L. huius ex sermone gnata an aula ei carior siet,
han liquet. quid ais? adfinem vin' adhibere
me, Euclio?
dasne eam?
E. mirum quin ego dem tibi eam quae tota abiit
mihi.
L. abiit?
E. immo abreptast, et nunc aliquis aliquo in
angulo
e misera voluptatem digitis oculis improbis capit.
L. pol hominem, quem praedicas, si repperero
usquam gentium,
occidam.
E. at ego caedam misere, et post membratim
conteram.
attatat: ut iste inpuris tractet manibus illos
aureos—
L. crines, heu!
E. Nummos, heu! Philippos
nam qua de re loquere tu?
L. de mea aula, quam tibi dixi.
E. pereat.
L. perit iam satis.
E. ego vero loquebar de tua gnata: eam mi uxorem
volo.
Euclio, numquid tibi causaest quin mi eam in
matrimonium
conloces? ita recte fiet atque adeo ut leges
iubent.

E. quoniam eam tu corrupisti, etiam tibi habendast,
arbitror ;
sed sine dote.

L. valeant dotes.

E. nam mi nihil est unde dem.

SCENA II.

STROBILUS. EUCLIO. LYCONIDES.

L. sed quis hic advorsum ornatus peregrinum in
modum

incedit graviter voltu cum gravissimo ?

vide sis, ut se fert hic magnificentissime.

numquam usquam quemquam memini me hac
facie prius

hominem videre aut his vestitum vestibus.

a : video teneo, subolet : hic Strobilus est.

peream nisi ipse est meus Strobilus. herele qui
nimis avide exspecto si quid lusus siet.

S. evax : probe factumst, quod ego in hasce aedes
senis

modo per posticum me penetravi clanculum,

Staphyla adiutrice. ibi condidi aulam. ea nunc
latet

in armario, quod mox seni indicavero.

pol, ut abstinere ab auro vix potui manus ;

ita pruriebant digiti, sed metui nimis

ne post pruriret dorsus hic peiusculum.

hosce adgredibor homines quosque ante hunc
diem

ludos ego feci, eos herele non cassae nucis

facio, praeut hodie ludificabor hunc senem.

em : dat erus signum se iam cognovisse me.

L. salve, pater : quid quaeris ?

S. quaero homines probos.

L. tibi adsumus, eccos.

S. et ego vobis tertius.

L. credo. at enim certe ita circumspectabas, quasi
conquirereres quid.

S. quin conquirebam.

L. an mihi

licet id rogare quid siet ?

S. licet. roga.

L. rogo igitur. quid conquiris ?

S. cuncta. conspicor

quae sunt erunt fuerunt in terra mari
caelo.

E. edepol oculis hic oculatust pluribus

ipse Argus quam fuit. utinam ego ita natus
forem,

aulam ut meam potessem conspicarier

in caelo pelago terra, quocumque in loco.

L. nova plane et mirast quam te tute praedicas
facultatem habere.

S. rem tibi fabulor tamen.

L. numne occipitium potis es contuerier

tuom tibimet ipsi, aut lapideum per parietem
vel puteum in imum, quid ibi sit, scrutarier ?

S. sic est.

E. at apud nos vix hoc est qui creduat.

istam potestatem, ni nevis, dic unde habes.

S. virtute divom et generis.

L. em, tragoedias

agit hic. cothurnos loquitur. nisi molestum erit,
lubenter ex te nomen istuc inclutum

audirem, simul et patriae et generis quoniam es.

S. datumst mihi nomen Polygoetomantidi.

oraculo prognatus illo Delphico,

nepos Trophoni, pronepos sum quercuum

Dodonaearum.

L. immo ulmeae generi tuo

conveniunt virgae potius.

at te serio

rogo, num facultas est tibi istaec ?

autumo.

L. quin experiris, Euclio, si quid sciat
seu videat sive olfaciat sive aliquo modo
quid persentiscat de istoc auro ?

S. bene mones.

heus, advena, audin ? potin' ut aliquam rem
meam
velis invare ?

S. si etiam sit in rem meam.

sed nondum adflatus praesto est factus, qui
solet.

L. nam quis deum te movet ?

S. dea Argentaria.

istuc quidem aderit numen propitium tibi.

S. sat habeo. iam rogare pergitote me.

quid id est quod voltis ?

L. hunc, quaeso, aspicedum senem,
quoniam modi sit.

S. video. sordidissimus,

lacrumis inedia macie confectissimus,

inliberalis, pannis obsitissimus.

L. non te istuc quaero. vide sis. scin quid ei
male est ?

S. scio.

L. quid ergo est ?

S. perdidit aurum.

L. qui potes
id scire, quom me neque tu nosti ante hunc
diem

neque quisquam id habere me aurum scibat ?

S. quin rogas

quicquid vis aliud ?

L. scin' quantum auri perdidit ?

S. aulam quadrilibrem plenam.

L. sine dubio hic homo

divinus est, merus vates. O Poly—quid, malum,

cluet istuc nomen inmemorabilissimum ?—

O Polysyllabice, amabo, per deos et deas
quantumst, te imploro atque obsecro, ut misero
mihi

des operam, et aurum ut invenias quod perdidit.

S. istuc tibi non orasse potius proderit.

malam tibi ipsi rem oras.

L. valde oro tamen.

S. esto : invocabo divos, ut vatem decet.

ades tu tuo nunc nepoti, Trophoni.

animi mei recessus quate, inde ut responsum

dem verax, ut soleo : tuque adsis, Apollo.

mihi numen venit, euhoe ! merus totusque
oculus sum.

ego usque a columnis Herculeis ad Pontum

contempler quae aguntur. contueor

scelestam

aulam auro scelesto refertam : hanc apage a me !
nam cur tu scelestam dicis ?

S. pestis impurissima est.

E. sed dic, quaeso, ubi est ?

S. istuc non, si sapis, rogaveris.

L. obsecro te—

vin' periisse ? aut animi satin' tu sanus es,

quippe qui ted ipsum impura properes peste
perdere ?

L. sed, sodes—

S. aula ista ecferta miseriis in aedibus
hisce inest iam.

E. meisne in aedibus ? edepol istuc falleris.

S. numquam ego fallor. hisce in aedibus, hoc in
hospitio mali,

Dirarum hoc in bacchanali, furiarum hoc in
latibulo—

L. at re vera ibi est ?

S. ibi est. ad laevam video armarium—
cia, quam subito hinc in aedes avolvit inpetu.

mirumst ni iuventutem senibus reddit aurum
 eruribus.
 satin', ere, ut meis facietis illum hominem
 fallaciis
 adinemordi? meus homost iam. sed quod re-
 liquomst hoc age
 ut doli quicquid ego incepero ei tu subvenias
 probe.
 vidistine quas ei, quom aulam criminabar
 crimine
 noxiam fore et scelestam, inieci sollicitudines?
 hau temere illud feci: at quorsum haec tendunt
 iam tibi erit palam.
 sed foras eceum exit auro oneratus—et meis dolis.

(EUCLIO INTRAT.)

E. O festiva hora, O deliciis et voluptatibus cefer-
 tissima:
 habeo, teneo, quam perdideram, quam ploravi
 peramatam aulam.
 melculum, coreulum,
 saviis te accipio, salto prae gaudio,
 gestio ob laetitiam laete cantare, velut
 cantare solent hilares aestate cicadellae.
 at vates ille dixerat malam rem ex te futuram:
 quid significavit hauscio: nam, si mala tute
 res es,
 mihi sint sescentae, quaeso, res te etiam multo
 peiores.
 sed tamen quae mihi dixit adhuc, repperi
 cuncta veracia aequae esse ac si iurasset
 ipsa mi Veritas, nescio quae subit
 aegra suspitio, ne quid aliquo ex loco
 unde nil timeam aut expectem subito exoriatur
 malum.
 me tamen hanc aulam habere, id satis bene scio.
 salve, vates veracissime; di me servatum volunt.
 immo herele vero perpetuo pessumdatum.
 quis hinc mihi laevus crocit corvus obstrepens?
 numnam isti amanter vasculo das savia
 scelerato, oppleto diris et molestiis?
 vide sis, adulescens, qua facie videtur hic
 quo vultu quo colore quibus oculis, malum
 ex quo illud repperit inque manibus optinet?
 quid agis, socer mi?
 quidne agam? thesaurum ego
 habeo repertum.
 scio, sed quaenam te ita agitat
 mala res, aut quisnam est iste morbus, qui adlici
 hunc in modum mortifere subito coeptus es?
 quid vis, malum, istis verbis?
 quia viridis tuom
 os occupavit pallor, exardescere
 incipiunt oculi—
 nugas agis.
 immo, ita facit
 aurum istue. id depone parumper obsecro.
 egon hoc deponam?
 pone: post intelleges.
 eceum depono. sed vos hinc paulum prius
 apscendite: apstate etiam longiusculum.
 sic facimus.
 em: posivi.
 di vostram fidem,
 nimis mirumst quomodo alter fit subito hic homo.
 vix equidem quicquam sentio.
 meus hic homost.
 coepit iam formidare. profligavimus
 hostes: turbantur: pugnam iam magis strenuam
 huic intendamus, dum se det suasque res.
 quid vos vobiscum loquimini?

E. vix audeo
 tibi dicere istue.
E. quid istae sunt mysteria,
 Polyverivates? dic mihi, amabo.
E. esto: eloquar.
 hoc age: vocivas da mihi aures, dum loquar.
 iam plurimi anni sunt ex quo improbissimus
 homo in hisce habitabat aedibus nefariis:
 is homo sceleratus hospitem occidit suom,
 qui ad eum devorsus erat. is id fecit scelus
 ob istue aurum, quod secum hospes tetulerat.
 quod quom perfecit, aurum occisor habet sibi
 et in aula, quam invenisti, servat clanculum.
 boni tamen inde nil capit, sed miseriis,
 intemperiiis, molestiis, cruciatibus,
 morbis, conficitur. surdus fit, edentulus,
 exsanguis, caecus, claudus. gemitus est merus.
 numquam dormire potis est. gustatu caret.
 eius gnatae conrumpuntur, filii sibi
 adseiscunt quisque mortem: mox et ipse obit.
 sed iam moriturus hanc in aedibus suis
 defodit aulam, et diras imprecatus est
 ei, qui inveniret casu ubi esset condita.
 tute invenisti.
E. fateor.
 homo miserrimu's.
 dum humo latebat neque erat quisquam conscius
 salvae domo res huic erant. dum tute habes,
 dirae illae semper te novis angoribus
 cruciabunt, macerabunt, conficient.
E. ohe!
 hauscio ego an vera praedices, nam animi satis
 sum maceratus hodie.
 nil istue quidemst
 praent una et animum et corpus macerabere.
 meministine ipsam neevoluisse aurum sibi
 fidem commissum habere?
 quinam id tu tenes?
 qui cetera illa teneo? quia divino ego
 sum genere natus, ut dixi.
E. at certe licet
 mihi rursus aulam defodere atque identidem
 inspicere?
 quidni? si vis te ipsum perdere.
 sed quid ea faciam?
 scio quid te faciet ea. nam te exedent
 lemures larvaeque. insanus fies.
E. sed, bone vir, doce
 quid me oportet facere, oro ted.
 em, docebo—gnatam habes:
 illa primo suos lavato digitos porci sanguine.
 tum capito aulam summis digitis atque au-
 aram ponito.
 dein trimestrem sacrificio poreum dis ultoribus.
 tum illa Philippos summis digitis eximito aul-
 singulos,
 eos aqua pure currenti purigato, et tergito:
 frangito aulam ipsam et post tergum fragmi-
 abieito procul.
 deinde Philippos ex hisce aedibus secum quae
 velit ferat.
 fiet ordine istae; illos filiae nummos dabo
 dotem ut erga eam tu superbus ne sies, Lyconi-
 ibo ea iam paratum. numquid aliud vol-
 iam hic ero.
 quid ere? ais, factumst ex tua sententia?
 nihil unquam vidi lepidius.
 quin me, ere, manu
 emittis?
 emitto, atque adeo id facio lubens.
 salve, patrone; numquid vis?
CASTOR. vos plaudite.

NOTES.

PINDAR, *Nem.* VII. 17.

σοφοί δὲ μέλλοντα τριταῖον ἄνεμον
ἐμαθον, οὐδ' ὑπὸ κέρδει βάλλον.

With the contentions which have raged over the last clause this note has no concern. Why Pindar should have chosen as an example of cleverness the power to predict a wind *three* days before, no one has explained. The following passage from Strabo (vi. 276) seems to give the source of the metaphor. Strabo is quoting from Polybius an account of the island Hephaistos, or Hiera (modern Volcano) off the coast of Sicily εἰς μὲν οὖν νότος μέλλει πνεῖν, ἀχλὺν ὁμιχλώδη καταχεῖσθαι κύκλῳ φησὶ τῆς νησίδος ὥστε μηδὲ τὴν Σικελίαν ἀπῶθεν φαίνεσθαι· ὕταν δὲ βορέας, φλόγας καθαρὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ λεχθέντος κρατῆρος εἰς ὕψος ἐξαίρεσθαι καὶ βρόμους ἐκπέμπεσθαι μέλους· τὸν δὲ ζέφυρον μέσσην τινὰ ἔχειν τάξιν. τοὺς δὲ ἄλλους κρατῆρας ὁμοειδεῖς μὲν εἶναι, τῇ δὲ βία λείπεσθαι τῶν ἀναφυσημάτων· ἐκ τε δὴ τῆς διαφορᾶς τῶν βρόμων καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πόθεν ἄρχεται τὰ ἀναφυσήματα καὶ αἱ φλόγες καὶ αἱ λιγνύες προσσημαίνεσθαι καὶ τὸν εἰς ἡμέραν τρίτην πάλιν μέλλοντα ἄνεμον πνεῖν· τῶν γοῦν ἐν Λιπαράις γενομένης ἀπλοίας προσιπεῖν τινὰς φησὶ τὸν ἐσόμενον [ἄνεμον] καὶ μὴ διαψεύσασθαι.

The date of the 7th Nemean is fixed at 461 B.C. Pindar had been in Sicily long before, and had already shown how much he was impressed not merely by the volcanic features of Etna, but also of all this region as far as Cumae in the 1st Pythian (18 sqq.): ταῖ θ' ὑπὲρ Κύμας ἀλιερκεές ὄχθαι, | Σικελία τ' αὐτοῦ πῖξ' ἐστέρνα λαχνάεντα· κίων δ' οὐρανία συνέχει, | νιφόεσσ' Αἴτνα, πάντες χιόνος ὀξείας τιθήνα· | τὰς ἐρεύγονται μὲν ἀπλάτου πυρὸς ἀγνόταται | ἐκ μυχῶν παγαί.

Professor Robertson Smith informs me that at this very day the boatmen of the island Volcano aver that they know whether the anchorage off the island is safe for some time to come, from the sounds made by the crater.—WILLIAM RIDGEWAY.

ÆSCHYLUS *Eumenides*, 631, 2.

ἀπὸ στρατείας γάρ νιν ἡμποληκότα
τὰ πλείστ' ἄμεινον εὐφροσιν δεδεγμένη.

It seems most likely that the second line originally contained εὐνουν, running as follows:—

τὸ πλείστον, εὐνουν εὐφροσιν δεδεγμένη
ον εὐνο[υ]ν having been corrupted to αμεινον, τὸ πλείστον would necessarily be altered to τὰ πλείστ'. Or perhaps ἄμεινον stood in the text—

ἄμεινον, εὐφρον' εὐφροσιν, δεδεγμένη

and τὰ πλείστα, inserted in the margin to explain it, was copied in, so displacing εὐφρον'. The phrase εὐφρον' εὐφροσιν ('well-disposed to such as were well-minded towards himself') is in keeping both with the context, and with the scene in the 'Agamemnon,' to which this passage relates, viz. that of the King's reception, especially vv. 805—9, 832—50. On the other hand, it is more than improbable that the poet made εὐφροσιν do duty for εὐφροσιν ἔπεισι (like the Homeric μειλίχια and κερτόμια) or for εὐφροσύναις ('with festivities') instead of simply writing εὐφρόνως. ἡμποληκότα is equally translatable with ἄμεινον ('having dealt, i.e. fared, well on the whole') or with τὸ πλείστον ('having procured his chief object,' the capture of Troy. Cf. Soph. *Trachin.* 93.)

G. C. WARR.

FURTHER NOTE ON ARISTOPHANES, *Ranæ* 1028.—In the June number of the *Classical Review* I proposed to emend the corrupt verse,

ἐχάρην γοῦν ἡνίκ' ἤκουσα περὶ Δαρείου τεθνεῶτος,
by reading

ἐχάρην γοῦν ἡνίκ' ἐκώκυσα, πόρι Δαρείου τεθνεῶτος.

Mr. A. E. Housman has favoured me with an interesting suggestion, which he permits me to communicate to the *Review*. With reference to the phrase πόρι Δαρείου he writes, 'The phrase plainly is one which a comic writer would hardly himself invent; and, if Aristophanes did employ it, the surmise would be natural that Aeschylus in the *Persæ* had actually called Xerxes πόρις Δαρείου as a variation on πῶλος. I think perhaps he had.'

The epode *Pers.* 677 sqq. is handed down in this nonsensical form:—

ὦ πολὺκλαυτε φίλοισι θανών,
τί τάδε δυνάτα δυνάτα
περὶ τᾷ σᾷ δίδυμα διαγόνει δι' ἀμάρτια
πάσα γὰρ τᾷδε
ἐξέφθινται τρίσκαλμοι
νῆες ἄναες ἄναες.

Blomfield suggested τί τάδε δυνάτα δυνάτα παιδὶ τῷ σῷ; perhaps Aeschylus wrote πόρι τῷ σῷ, which would explain the alteration τᾷ σᾷ by a scribe unfamiliar with πόρις masculine. The rest of the passage might possibly run thus: δίδυμα διὰ γοῶν ἀμάρτια πάσα γὰρ τᾷδε ἐξέφθινται τρίσκαλμοι νῆες ἄναες, λαὸς ἄλαος, which would make sense of δίδυμα.—R. Y. TYRRELL.

In the *Museum Marbles*, pt. xi. p. 36 mention is made of a bas-relief representing Demosthenes on the altar at Calauria, and inscribed

ΔΗΜΩ (sic) ΣΘΕΝΗΣ
ΕΠΙΒΩΜΙΟΣ

This bas-relief is described by Winckelmann, who gives an engraving of it taken from a cast (*Storia delle Arti*, ed. Fea ii. p. 256). It formerly belonged to Dr. Mead, but its subsequent history has hitherto been unknown. I have the satisfaction of stating that it is now in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin. It had been inserted in the chimney-piece of a room which until a few years ago was used as a museum, and where it had probably been since the erection of the building in 1759. Mead's sale was in 1755. How it came to Dublin is not known.—T. K. ABBOTT.

PARVM CAVISSE VIDETVR.

HOR. a, p. 351—353

verum ubi plura nitent in carmine, non ego paucis
offendar maculis, quas aut incuria fudit
aut humana PARVM CAVIT natura.

Some twelve years ago I had the great good fortune to see something of Jakob Bernays. Among other matters, he instanced this passage as a proof of the narrow reading of editors of Horace. For if any of them had read Fronto, he must have illustrated Horace from these words *de feriis Alsiensibus*, p. 227, 13 Naber)

si quempiam condemnas, PARVM CAVISSE VIDETVR ais.

The illustration seemed to me quite new, and I cited it to many friends, not suspecting that it had been recorded in my interleaved *Corpus Poetarum* since 1851 or 1852, when I first read Fronto. For there Heindorf cites Horace, and also Festus, s.v. *parum*. —JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

UNIVERSITY INTELLIGENCE.

OXFORD.

THE elections to Council ended in a compromise, and the only contest resulted in what seemed a defeat of Natural Science and a victory of Conservative reaction. Perhaps a majority of Congregation would like a little rest from legislation for the present. The statute founding a school of Modern Language and Literature was thrown out; the votes being equal in a very full house: and the abolition of the Professorship of Poetry was negatived by an overwhelming majority. The first of these votes implies no hostility to the study of Modern Languages: but the Philologists had amended the statute mercilessly so as to give Literature no chance, and it was also felt that the school had been overburdened with subjects which hardly one man in ten years would take up, while the University would have to find a teaching and examining staff, at an expense quite disproportioned to the results obtained. We were threatened with a large diversion of students to Cambridge: but we might spare the half-dozen second- and third-classmen who have as yet distinguished themselves in the new school at that University. It is fair to add that the ladies have been more successful there: and it matters nothing to learning, or to its professors, what is the sex of a student, or whether he or she has gone through the form of matriculation and graduation: but even here the results point to a less ambitious start, with only those languages and literatures which are likely to attract a considerable body of students, and in which it is possible to find examiners who are not also the sole teachers. Meanwhile much might be done by encouraging or requiring the study of books other than English in the existing Schools.

The other discussion turned mainly on the value of the traditions of the Chair of Poetry, on the desirability of giving non-residents some ground for keeping their names on the books and occasionally visiting the University, and on the results of election by Boards of various kinds. The Boards were declared to be too large to feel any responsibility, and too small to be safe from pressure: and the appropriation by Language of the English Chair, which it should have shared with Literature, drove many to the conclusion that the same thing would somehow happen again if a Chair of English Literature were set up. The most rational suggestion made was that a readership for a term of years was better than a professorship for life. And if any college possesses a man who could draw crowds to his lectures on the subject, it is not easy to see why either would be wanted—unless as a recognition by the University when the success is unquestionable. The attack made on the colleges, in one of these debates, might very well be retorted on the University, as College Tutors have in the past been quite as useful and quite as eminent as the average professors:—indeed the renown of some very eminent Professors is due almost entirely to the days when the University had not recognised them. It may be added that 'The University' as represented in Congregation consists almost wholly of the despised 'Colleges', with a considerable addition of the local clergy and those Professors who do not hold official fellowships, the latter class being much the smaller. And it may further be hinted that the Colleges are always expected to find the money and may reasonably have something to say to the use made of it by this miscellaneous body.

CAMBRIDGE.

A memorial from over eight hundred members of the Senate was presented to the Council on Nov. 19, asking that steps may be taken to allow women who are duly qualified to proceed to the B.A. degree. Most of the signatures are those of non-residents.

Mr. M. R. James is to go out to Cyprus in place of Mr. H. B. Smith, as at first proposed.

Mr. H. E. Ryle (King's) is the new Hulsean Professor.

For Scholarships see page 324.

ARCHÆOLOGY.

THE LYGDAMIS INSCRIPTION.

HAVING lately had occasion to examine closely the Lygdamis inscription (B.C. 460–455) in the British Museum, I have remarked certain peculiarities in some of the letters which, I believe, have hitherto escaped notice.

First, the letters Theta and Omikron are both represented by one form: a circle with a point (or small hole) in the centre, thus  (see Kirchhoff *Studien*, 4th ed. p. 12, table I. i.). This central point, as we know, marks the later form of Theta; but as part of

Omikron it is not very common, as appears from Kirchhoff's tables. Now, casting one's eyes over the inscription, one is struck by the fact that the incised ring of this symbol is shallower and broader and at the same time smoother in workmanship than the cutting of other letters. Moreover, the ring is a perfect circle. It is evident that it is not cut, as other letters, with the chisel, but with a mechanical tool working after the fashion of a modern centre-bit, the point or hole in the centre being made by the pivot on which the cutter revolves. This being so, however the point may count as an integral

part of Theta, it goes for nothing in the case of Omikron. It is simply there for the convenience of the sculptor, who found a centre-bit much more handy for a circular letter than the chisel and mallet. As regards the supersession of the cross in the archaic form of Theta by the simple point in the later form of the letter, it may not be too much to suggest that the change originated in the use of a mechanical tool such as the centre-bit. Material and implements have always exercised much influence on the changes in forms of letters. In papyri and mediaeval MSS. Theta has the bar, the lineal descendant of the archaic cross.

That the point in the centre of Omikron in the Lygdamis inscription is due to the above cause, is confirmed by the variations in the letter Omega. Kirchhoff has remarked that, following the analogy of the central-pointed Omikron, the Omega in the latter part of the inscription is also furnished with a central point, thus Ω . The fact is, that the sculptor cut his Omegas in the greater part of the inscription with the chisel; but, when approaching the end, he seems to have bethought him that he could more readily make the segment of a circle required for the letter with the centre-bit—and the happy thought was acted upon with the result of very symmetrical segments with the small pivot-hole in the centre.

It would be interesting to know to what extent central points in other inscriptions are due to the same cause.

In connexion with the Lygdamis inscription, there also arises an interesting question as regards the peculiar symbol which is there used to represent $\sigma\sigma$ in certain names. This symbol has the form T (quite distinct from the Tau, which has no pendants), the same that appears on certain Thracian coins and in an inscription of Teos (see Kirchhoff, p. 12). It has been identified with the symbol from which the later Sampi is derived, and which is itself derived from the ancient Greek San and Phoenician Tsade (Taylor, *Alphabet*, ii. 97). Now, this inscription records a decree concerning certain property in Halikarnassos, passed probably at the time of the expulsion of the tyrant Lygdamis, not later than B.C. 455. Halikarnassos was Herodotos's native city, which he did not finally quit till the year 443. It is then more than probable that the historian may have set eyes on this very inscription. But he himself tells us that the *letter* ($\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\mu\mu\alpha$) which the Ionians call Sigma the Dorians call San. The Sigma of the inscription is ξ . The Ionians would call it Sigma;

the Dorians San. What then would be the name of the $\sigma\sigma$ symbol T? If Herodotos is right, surely not San, which, as we have just seen, was given to ξ . Has Herodotos used the word *letter* where he should have used the word *sound*?

E. MAUNDE THOMPSON.

P.S.—Since writing the above, I have had an opportunity of seeing an early copy of Mr. Roberts' *Greek Epigraphy*, and find that he also has noticed the use of a circling tool for cutting Theta and Omikron.

AN ARCHAIC GREEK VASE.

THERE is in the British Museum an archaic Greek vase which Mr. Cecil Smith published some years ago in the *Hellenic Journal* (I. p. 202, pl. 7), giving a very interesting explanation of the subject printed on it. The vase is in the form of a kylix, and the figures with which we are concerned are disposed on the outside of it. Mr. Smith has separated the figures into two groups, the main one representing a marriage procession with the attendant ceremony of the sacrifice of a bull. The other group, consisting of figures dancing, or at least moving actively round a goat, he connects with the victory of a tragic chorus. In this latter interpretation there is every reason to believe that he is right. But there being no apparent connexion between a tragic victory and a marriage procession, we should expect these scenes to be more clearly separated on the vase. Failing that, and taking the representation of the tragic victory as proved, we may look for a corresponding scene among the other figures. The bull was the prize of a dithyrambic victory, and the leading of it here to sacrifice with a flute-player piping on his flutes would be a very suitable representation of such an event. Another archaic vase in the Museum (Cat. 687 = Panofka, *Vasi di Premio*, pl. 4b), gives us just such a scene under circumstances which leave little doubt of its meaning, since on the opposite side of the vase we see Dionysos and two other figures riding in a car in the form of a ship on wheels. That would show us the celebration of both a comic and a dithyrambic victory.

If, then, on the vase with which we are particularly concerned, we have a tragic and possibly a dithyrambic victory, responding to each other on the two sides of the vase, we ought next to look for some indication of the comic contest also. To that end we observe that these two main scenes are separated at one point by a cart drawn by a pair of

mules and full of persons, among them one holding a wreath. As the comic contests were characterized by such expressions as ἐξ ἀμάξης λαλεῖν, the scene on the vase may be held to point to them. The prize was a basket of figs and an amphora of wine. But there appears to be no reference to it on the vase.

The two main scenes are again separated at the opposite point by a figure of Athena in the attitude and aspect with which we are familiar on the Panathenaic prize vases. To make this comparison more complete, there is a column behind her, just as on these vases, to indicate the stadium at Athens. This group would recall the Panathenaic contests. In front of Athena is an altar, and on it a bird, possibly the cock, which figures on the Panathenaic vases as one of her symbols, and is otherwise known as such. Towards the altar a female figure carrying a tray on her head advances, possibly with some reference to the sacrifice which followed the Panathenaic games.

If the explanation here proposed is right, the whole exterior of the vase would represent the celebration of victories gained in public contests at Athens. It will follow that the vase is later than the institution of the Panathenaic games, B.C. 556. As the latter half of the sixth century B.C. was a period of great activity in replacing the rude performances of older times by the regular drama, we are tempted to regard this vase as a contemporary illustration of what was then to be seen in Athens, somewhere between B.C. 550–500. The vase was obtained from Athens, but whether found there or not is not said.

A. S. MURRAY.

ACQUISITIONS OF BRITISH MUSEUM.

A large selection of fragments of Greek pottery, from the site of the ancient Daphnae (Tell Defenneh) in lower Egypt, discovered last year by Mr. Flinders Petrie (see my article in the *Illustrated London News*, Sept. 11, 1886): presented by the Egypt Exploration Fund. If we may accept the statement that the Ionian and Karian mercenaries were settled here by Psammetichos I. and were removed by Amasis, we have an exact limit of date for this pottery, about B.C. 580–560. The following styles are represented:—1. A few fragments representing a late development of the Mykenae style, found in the same chamber with archaic xoana in stone and terra-cotta. 2. A local fabric (!), black varnish designs with free use of purple and incised lines: the typical form is certainly imitated from the long copper Egyptian sacrificial bucket, with a similar scheme of decoration; in some cases even the subject is semi-Egyptian. 3. 'Polledrara' ware. 4. A good deal of so-called 'Fikellura' ware. 5. Large amphorae of black metallic glaze, with scenes on neck in black and purple on red. 6. B. f. fragments with scale pattern

and friezes of grotesque Seileni and Maenads, warriors and mounted Amazons. 7. Stray fragments of 'Cyrene' ware. Besides the pottery are a few fragments of gold work, gems and scarabs.

A series of objects from tombs at Thebes; eight bronze fibulae, of which three are engraved with archaic designs, viz. (1) *obr.* a swan, *rev.* a dolphin. (2) *obr.* and *rev.* a water-bird. (3) *obr.* and *rev.* a rosette of four petals; a bronze armilla, each end terminating in two knobs: a bronze S-shaped hair ornament: a bronze mirror engraved on both sides with circles and a rosette of six petals: and a bronze fragment with incised zigzags: a spear head, knife, and pick, in iron: two painted vases, b. f., scarlet, and white, on buff, viz. (1) a dish with one handle, on *ext.* geometric panels containing alternately a palmette, and a bird flying to l. (2) flat pyxis with lid, geometric patterns: four beads, variegated glass and steatite: a steatite scarab with seated Sphinx and an ankh: a bronze ring with intaglio of seated girl holding a wreath.

Bronze statuette of Venus, 0.14 m. high, found on the coast of Asia Minor opposite Chios: it is of late Roman work, and in type most resembles the Louvre statue, Clarac, pl. 342 no. 879: she wears stephane, twisted armlets and bracelets; the object once held up in the r. is lost.

A series of objects from excavations at Marion in Cyprus; the Oidipous lekythos, the Pasiades alabastos and the silver ring with gold fly (found with the alabastos) mentioned, *Classical Review*, *ante*, p. 25; the objects found in the same series of tombs with these, viz. (1) the προσαγορεύω cup, Klein, *Meistersignaturen*?, p. 221, also found with the alabastos; (2) a tall red jug, on the shoulder a seated female in the round holding a jug which forms the spout: decorated with a white wreath: (3) a similar jug, with black branches and birds: (4, 5) two jugs similar: (6) a kotyle, black glaze: (7) a slender jug, drab. The silver girdle and armlet, and the gold earring, pendants and beads, all engraved in *Arch. Jahrbuch*, 1887, pl. 8: a pair of silver bracelets, and fragments: and three objects found together in a tomb, viz. (1) a silver coin of Idalion, about 520–500 B.C.; (2) a silver convex disk; and (3) a marble male torso of very beautiful archaic sculpture.

Bronze statuette of Herakles, with lionskin over head and wound round l. arm: beardless, and has held some object in l. palm: r. rests on hip: fine Graeco-Roman work; ht. 0.16 m.

Five steatite beads from Anaphè.

Handle of diota stamped ΕΥΝΦΟ, from Thasos.

Objects found in Majorea (see note *post.*) (1) two rough terra-cotta statuettes of Aphrodite; (2) ten vases of the late types such as come from Sardinia, including one small Samian bowl; (3) a terra-cotta lamp: all of late Roman period.

Marble group of Ganymedes and the eagle, Graeco-Roman: Ganymedes leans against the stem of a tree and looks round towards the eagle which seizes him from the back: the nearest resemblance to this type is Overbeck, *Kunstmyth.* pl. viii. 21.

Marble torso of youthful Dionysos found at Tralles and published in *Archaeologia* xlix. 2, p. 318 and pl. xix. by Admiral Spratt, C.B., who presents it to the Museum; the figure stands with l. leg crossed over r., wearing a nebris, fastened on the l. shoulder, and holds with both hands a bunch of grapes against his breast; see Reinach in *Revue Arch.* July 1887, p. 97, who gives a sketch: his remarks as to the work are undoubtedly justified.

Terra-cotta mortar and pestle both painted a dull black and pierced for suspension (!): from Athens.

B. f. pinax : within a circle of dots Apollo Citharæodous and a deer standing between two females who are seated facing each other on stools ; behind Apollo hangs a basket containing a lekythos ; in field, branches : in exergue, two dolphins confronted : from Athens.—CECIL SMITH.

CHAERONEIA.—The colossal lion which commemorated the Thebans slain at the battle of Chaeroneia, and which has lain till now in fragments on the plain, is again to be set up on its original site. The work is to be superintended by Dörpfeld. It is not generally known that two casts, of the head and hindquarters of this lion, exist in the cellars of the British Museum.—C. S.

CYPRUS.—The success of the recent excavations on the site of the ancient Marion (Poli-tis-Chrysokhou) and which have resulted in the discovery of antiquities belonging to the best periods of Greek Art, have at last goaded the British public into action. Something is now to be done towards justifying, from an archaeological point of view, our occupation of the island. A special meeting of the Hellenic Society was held on Nov. 3rd, at which it was decided that an appeal should be issued to the public for subscriptions. The excavations will be conducted in connection with the Oxford and Cambridge travelling studentships, nominally under the superintendence of the British School at Athens : and the entire scheme is to be controlled by a central committee in London, comprising representatives of the various interests involved. It is much to be hoped that the matter will not end here, but that the Government will see its way to making the special grant for which application has been made by the Trustees of the British Museum.—C. S.

EGYPT.—The Egypt Exploration Fund propose shortly to issue two new publications : the one volume will contain a detailed account of the work at Daphnae, Nebesheh, and the 2nd part of Tanis ; the other, an account of the second year's excavations at Naukratis, which will thus form vol. ii. of Mr. Petrie's original publication dealing with this site.

Mr. Petrie will publish in the spring a very interesting collection of an immense number of *graffiti* which he has copied at various sites in Upper Egypt, with *facsimiles*.—C. S.

IASOS.—Mr. Paton mentions (*ante*, p. 176) a number of inscriptions recently discovered in this island. In the courtyard of the Seraglio Museum I saw in August a number of marbles newly arrived, which I understood had come from Iasos, and are probably those to which he refers.—C. S.

MAJORCA.—Mr. H. P. Warin writes with reference to the antiquities from this island recently presented to the British Museum by him (see *Acquisitions*, p. 316), 'They were found by me on the coast of Alcudia Bay, about a mile from Alcudia and about 200 yards from the present water line, on a level sea-sand formation now grown over with scanty herbage, and about one foot four inches below the surface. There were very few signs of tombs beyond small collections of human bones mixed with the pottery, though in one or two cases there were something like rough tombstones. The smaller objects were found inside larger ones, the latter very imperfect ; in some cases a piece of flagstone covered them. These little collections of bones and pottery, as far as I recollect, seemed about six feet apart in either direction, and there must have been thirty or forty of them. Close by stands a small obelisk, called the cross of Santa

Ana. I am not aware of the object of this cross or obelisk. A statuette of copper is said to have been found near here also.'—C. S.

MINORCA.—Mr. J. B. Hue, who with Mr. Tuke has recently visited this island, has made a collection of the fragments of pottery which are thickly strewn around the curious megalithic towers there : 'the fragments were found in more or less abundance strewn over the ploughed fields around every Talayot or tower that we visited, with one notable exception, viz. the ship-shaped building near Ciudadela, known as the Nau de Tudons, which is totally different in form and much less primitive in masonry than the others. The potsherds were never found except in the vicinity of the Talayots. A very small proportion bore traces of colouring, and of those that did, a majority came from one site. The pattern was almost always plain red or black bands, the groundwork red or dirty yellow. Long fluted handles and extremities of amphoræ were frequent, but no traces of lamps : and of stone implements except one or two doubtful lumps of stone we found no traces ; and they appeared to be unknown to the local collectors. We found also traces of Samian ware in small quantities at most of the sites. One of the most interesting features were the city walls surrounding the group of towers, which appear to have been hitherto unnoticed. These are better preserved at the western extremity of the island. At San Carla the circuit is perfect, the wall being in places eight feet high, and the blocks and slabs of great size, the walls themselves being galleried in many places : worked stones, with the exception of the Biliton pillars, never occur.'—C. S.

MANTINEIA.—In the *Kunstchronik* of Oct. 13 is the following statement :—'The three large reliefs found in the excavations at Mantinea representing the musical contest between Apollo and Marsyas have been brought to Athens. Marsyas appears with the Phrygian flutes, Apollo with the lyre, surrounded by the Muses, as judges of the contest. There are many reasons for supposing that we have here the reliefs noted by Pausanias, which surrounded the pedestal of the statues of Apollo, Artemis, and Leto executed by Praxiteles. One thing is certain, that these reliefs belong to the finest period of Greek art, and that they are an important addition to the Central Museum of Athens.' In reference to this statement, Dr. Paul Wolters has very kindly written to me from the German Institute at Athens as follows : 'There have been found at Mantinea three reliefs, each about 1.5 m. long, which are now in the Central Museum. I enclose the photograph of one, containing the group of Apollo, Marsyas, and the Scythian. On the other two reliefs are represented six muses, so that we may suppose a fourth slab with three muses is wanting. The whole was one continuous representation, and may have served as the decoration of a large base, for the marks are still visible of the cramps with which these marbles were fastened to stones at the back. But the form of these cramps, as well as the workmanship, show that the reliefs are of a later date than the time of Praxiteles, and in any case it is quite impossible that they were works of Praxiteles himself. Mr. Kavvadias thinks that they nevertheless belonged to the pedestal mentioned by Pausanias, urging that Pausanias distinctly omits to say that the reliefs were made by Praxiteles or in his time. In that case we must certainly correct the context of Pausanias and read *Μοῦσαι* instead of *Μοῦσα* : and this idea I would not reject. The composition of the relief of which I send the photograph is the best. The muses seem to me to be copied from statuary

types, and the entire composition is consequently unsuitable. The reliefs are to be published in the next issue of the *Ἐφημερίς* or the *Bull. de Corr. Hellénique*.—C. S.

SIDON.—In the *Rev. Arch.*, July, p. 100, M. Reinach publishes an interesting account of the recent discoveries here. In August the bulk of the marble sculptures had just arrived at the Imperial Museum; the sarcophagi with reliefs, of which Hamdy Bey very kindly showed me photographs, are of great beauty and interest, and will form the subject of a detailed publication at his hands. It is proposed to erect a large new gallery outside the Seraglio Museum, in which these and other sarcophagi will be arranged.—C. S.

THASOS.—The interesting researches of Mr. and Mrs. Theodore Bent in this island during the spring, are, I am happy to say, to be continued. It will be remembered that Mr. Bent gave in these pages (*ante*, p. 210), a valuable account of his discoveries: a further account has been published in the form of a report to a Committee of the Royal Society, which furnished him with a small grant for this purpose. The Society has now renewed the grant for next year, and Mr. and Mrs. Bent intend starting for Thasos in January. Considering the rich promise that this island affords for archaeological research, it is much to be regretted that Mr. Bent's scope will be somewhat limited by the smallness of the funds at his disposal. In Thasos labour is very cheap, and the addition of even a very moderate sum may prove of inestimable value in the results. If any readers of the *Classical Review* should be willing to aid this good work, I should be very happy to receive and forward subscriptions. The inscriptions found this spring are all to be published in the forthcoming number of the *Hellenic Journal*. Mr. Hicks, who edits them, tells me that "they are nearly all late, of the Roman Imperial period. The only one that is dated is an inscription in honour of the Emperor Caracalla and of Julia Domna. There is one exception, however, which is not of this late date, viz.: a portion of a very interesting decree which refers apparently to the oligarchical revolution at Thasos described by Thucydides, viii. 64, (B.C. 411)." This decree is inadequately published by M. Reinach in the *Revue Arch.* for July, p. 82, who does not state that the stone was discovered, and uncovered, by Mr. and Mrs. Bent.—C. S.

TIRYNS.—In a recent number of the *Athenaeum* Mr. Penrose retracts in full his opinions as to the comparatively late date of the buildings excavated by Schliemann. After visiting the site in company with Dörpfeld and making a more minute examination of it he concludes that the objections which have been made as to the assumed antiquity of these remains, and which he brought forward at a special meeting in the rooms of the Soc. Ant. cannot be sustained; that (i) the stone saw was evidently used on the stones, not only of the Palace but also of the gateways both at Mykenae and Tiryns: and (ii) that there is a harmony both in the work and also in the direction and extent between the external walls and those of the Palace.—C. S.

TRIESTE.—With reference to a statement which recently appeared in the *Times* as to "important excavations at Trieste," Signor Puschi, Keeper of the Museo Civico di Antichità, has very courteously given me the following information: "The accounts of the Press are evidently exaggerated, for at present the 'excavations' consist merely in the construction of a canal about 2 m. wide, and 1 m. deep, at Barcola, a

village near here. We have found three chambers with mosaic pavements, of which one represents a Greek lady, black on a white ground, the second a polychrome pavement with a broad black band, and the third, which is only partially uncovered, has in one corner a black dolphin. The party walls are still to be traced. The locality is close to the sea-shore and the pavement lies at a level of 2.40 m. above the sea: the walls point N. and S. From a comparison with other mosaics found in the neighbourhood of Trieste, we may conclude that this one belonged to a private residence, and probably to a villa. Nothing else has been found. The site will in due time be properly excavated by this Museum: and if the excavations offer any points of interest, I shall willingly send you a detailed account for the *Classical Review*."—C. S.

Annuaire de la Société française de Numismatique. Sept—Oct. 1887. A. de Belfort, 'Imperial Roman Coins not described in Cohen's Work.' (Continued). The descriptive lists occupy pp. 421—433. A. Chagnier.—'Gaulish Numismatics.' Potin and bronze coins of the Sequani, Aedui &c. and varieties of the quinarii of Q. Doci, chief of the Sequani.

Zeitschrift für Numismatik. Berlin. Parts 2 and 3. 1887. Th. Mommsen.—'The Coins of C. Clodius Vestalis.'—On the date of the coins of Clodius described in Babelon, *monnaies de la République rom.* I. p. 354. Mommsen assigns them to the period B.C. 37—B.C. 16. Th. Mommsen.—'Mithradates Philopator Philadelphos.' On the coins and inscriptions bearing the name of this king, who is considered by Mommsen to be a son of Mithradates the Great, who ruled in Paphlagonia. It was previously supposed that he was 'Euergetes,' the father of Mithradates the Great.

Reviews. Head's 'Historia Numorum' by A. von Sallet.

Gazette Archéologique. 1887. Paris.

1. Bapst: a gold cup, ornament and plaque from Siverskaia: found with coins of Pairizades III., probably the work of Greek artists: two plates. 4. Bazin: two bronze statuettes, found in 1866 at Vienne, representing the Roman and Gallo-Roman types of Hercules: plate.

Obituary, L. de Ronchaud. Meetings of societies. News. Bibliography: reviews of Babelon 'Monnaies de la République Romaine': and of Perrot et Chipiez 'Histoire de l'art,' vol. iv.—C. S.

Archaeological Journal, xliv. 1 and 2 (173, 174):—(pp. 15–25) *The Walls of Chester*, Shrubsole. See a correspondence in the *Academy*.—(pp. 117–128) *Roman Inscriptions Discovered in Britain in 1886*, W. T. Watkin.—(pp. 164–184) *Roman Remains at Saintes*, B. Lewis.—(p. 205) Review of Morgan's *Roman Mosaic Pavements*. 'The book contains scarcely a third of the mosaics discovered in England, and cannot be recommended.'

Die Aithiopenländer des Andromedamythos, von Karl Tumpel. 8vo. Pp. 96. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner. 2 Mk. 40.

The author shews that the localization of the myth of Perseus and Andromeda at Jaffa, with the attendant explanation that Jaffa was once comprised in Aithiopia, cannot be traced beyond Theopompus: and contends that the Aithiopia of the earliest versions of the myth must be sought, not in Asia or in Africa, but near Rhodes. Of this contention he attempts no strict proof: apparently relying on the cumulative effect of a series of coincidences: that Kephios the father of Andromeda came from Achaia, and that there was a city named Achaia in Rhodes;

that Rhodes was the island of the Telchines, and that Telchis according to Stephanos was a city in Aithiopia: that the gods used to feast with the Aithiopians, and that the Gods' Table was a name for Astypalaia near Rhodes; and so forth. His

treatise is not a satisfactory piece of work, as he is throughout far more anxious to display the width of his reading than to establish his hypothesis.

CECIL TORR.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

The American Journal of Philology, vol. viii. 2, 1887.—The 'Agon of the Old Comedy,' by M. W. Humphreys, an analysis of the structure of Greek Comedy considered as exhibiting a contest; with the attack, defence, and final decision. This view which is maintained by Zielinski in 'Die Gliederung der altattischen Komödie' is shown to apply to all the plays of Aristophanes except the *Acharnians*, *Peace* and *Thesmophoriazusae*.—J. H. Moulton endeavours to show that 'original hard aspirates lose their aspiration in Greek, except when the accent immediately precedes'—H. Collitz writes in German on ἴφθιμος and Ved KSI.—B. L. Gildersleeve on μετὰ and σύν in reference to Tycho Mommsen's distinction.—H. Warren on *Civis* 94.—Notice of Menrad's *De Contractionis et Synizescos usu Homeric*, 'a thorough-going and satisfactory treatise by a scholar of Christ.'—A defence of the 'Sequence of Tenses in Latin' against the attack of W. G. Hale.—Strong and Pearson's *Juvenal*, 'Introduction good, notes too brief and sometimes inaccurate'—Ramsay's selections from *Tibullus* and *Propertius*, 'The notes run to the opposite extreme of fulness, sounder in grammar than the preceding, but occasionally careless.'

Athenaeum.—22 Oct. Review of Muirhead's 'Historical introduction to the private law of Rome;' notices of Woods' and Johnston's 'Three Anti-Pelagian treatises of St. Augustine,' Carr's 'The Church and the Roman Empire,' Strack's 'Einleitung in d. Talmud,' Derenbourg's 'Kalilah and Dimnah,' Nettleship's 'Passages for translation into Latin Prose,' and other school books. 5 Nov. Review of Renan's 'Histoire du Peuple d'Israël I;' notices of Geare's 'Notes on Thucydides Bk. I,' and of Marchant's 'Lat.-Eng. Dictionary' ('by far the best small Lat.-Eng. Dict. yet published'). 12 Nov. Letter of F. C. Penrose 'on the palaces of Tiryns and tombs at Mycenae,' he now agrees with Dörpfeld.

Academy.—22 Oct. Review by C. Oman of 'Gardner's Catalogue of Greek coins;' letters from T. W. Allen on 'Lucian Harl. 5694,' from W. T. Watkin and G. W. Shrubsole 'on the age of the Walls of Chester (cont.),' from F. Haverfield on Gomme's 'Romano-British Remains' (the discussion on the completeness of the collection is continued in the two next Nos.) 29 Oct. Review by A. H. Sayce of Fick's 'Hesiods Gedichte.' 12 Nov. Review by F. Haverfield of 'Merguet's Cäsar-Lexicon,' and of Bond and Walpole's 'Caesar' (pointing out many mistakes in translation of Kraner's German), the 'age of the Walls of Chester' is further discussed by E. P. L. Brock.

The Expositor, July. 'The Origin of the Christian Ministry,' by G. Salmon, a well-reasoned article, in which it is shown that, by A.D. 200, every church was ruled by a bishop with presbyters and deacons under him and that no memory existed of a different state of things, also that this is in keeping with the evidence of Justin Martyr and Ignatius. On the other hand the evidence before the end of the first century speaks of persons holding a position analogous to the later bishop and of a variety of Church

officers, but is not in favour of a separate order of presbyters. Dr. Hatch's view of the ἐπίσκοπος is opposed to the usage of the word in the G. T.

Aug. Revised Version (4) by B. F. Westcott, points out its superiority to the A. V. in regard to the discrimination of synonymous words (εἶναι, γίνεσθαι &c.).

Sept. 'A Problem in Criticism,' by T. E. Page, endeavours to prove by a comparison of Mark xiii. 14 with Matt. xxiv. 15, 16, and Luke xxi. 20, 21 (esp. from the parenthetic ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοεῖτω) that the Gospels borrow from an earlier written original, to which St. Mark approximates most nearly.—G. A. Simcox, on the 'Origin of the Christian Ministry,' shows an open mind and great faculty for guessing, does not come to any very positive conclusion.

Oct. Revised Version (5) by B. F. Westcott, 'brings out the vivid details of the original' [but might not some of these be attributed to the overstraining after picturesqueness, which characterises a language in its decline?].—J. Angus on 'Scriptural terms to denote Eternity.'

Nov. W. Milligan, on the 'Origin of the Christian Ministry,' considers that πρεσβύτεροι is a general word for all religious officers, that ἐπίσκοποι and διάκονοι are a later apostolic development, and that 'presbyter' in the special sense is again a development of the sub-apostolic age—First part of an interesting comparison between Justin Martyr and the Didache by C. Taylor.

English Historical Review, no. 8:—

(pp. 625-656) *Movements of the Roman Legions from Augustus to Severus*, E. G. Hardy.—(pp. 657-686) *Theophilus' Life of Justinian*, J. Bryce. Probably based on legend and of no authority.—(p. 729) *The Semiramis Legend*, J. Gilmore. Comp. pp. 97 and 393.—(p. 734) *Roman Dacia*, F. Haverfield. Comp. p. 100.

Hermes, vol. xxii. part 3 contains:—

1. *Die Ambrosianischen Odysseescholien*, by H. Schrader, who has lately collated the three MSS. in the Ambrosian Library at Milan (B. 99 p. sup.: E. 89: and Q. 88). He here describes size, material, number of 'hands' employed, and compares Scholia to see how far they can be referred to a common source. In opposition to W. Dindorf, he decides that B is the oldest (c. 1300), but the poorest in Scholia, while Q belongs to the 15th century, as A. Mai has already shown. Though E and Q have some points in common, they are still independent of one another, and B still more decidedly of both. In none are there Scholia of first-rate importance. But while these three are independent, E has striking resemblances with the Cod. Paris. 2403, and though neither can be copied from the other they are certainly derived from a common source. Q may possibly be copied from the Cod. Harl. 5674, though it has additional matter, possibly inserted by a later hand.

2. *Das Attische Timema*, by J. Beloch, who argues against the inference that in the first class the τίμημα was one-fifth of the whole property. This inference was drawn by Boeckh and accepted by Fränkel from

Demosth. *contr. Aphob.* 1.9 'πεντεκαίδεκα τάλαντων γὰρ τρία τάλαντα τίμημα.' Demosthenes reckons his father's property at about thirteen talents, and yet states that the τίμημα was three talents, which on Boeckh's hypothesis would be impossible. Beloch's own view is that three talents was the maximum τίμημα on moveable property (*Dem. contr. Aphob.* 1.7), and is consistent therefore with a property of thirteen or fifteen talents, while that D. is speaking of moveable property is proved by the fact that the money was paid to the symmory and not to the deme.

3. *Zu Deinarchos*, by Th. Thalheim, consisting of notes chiefly critical on sixteen passages.

4. *Ptolemaeus περὶ διαφορᾶς λέξεων* by G. Heylbut: a transcription from a codex of the 11th century, in the *Bibliotheca Ottoboniana*. Though Ammonius is closely followed, there are here points omitted in the copies of Ammonius derived from the Aldine edition, and among these are fresh fragments from *Isacus* and *Anacreon*.

5. *Herodot und Hekataios*, by H. Diels. Taking a middle position between Nitzsch's view that Herodotus was an original investigator of the first rank, and Sayce's that he was merely a skilful journalist picking up most of his information from books, Diels selects his relation to *Hekataios* as a fair sample of his mode of dealing with his authorities. First, however, the authenticity of the *περιήγησις Ἀσίης* is defended against Cobet. The doubt expressed in the Alexandrine catalogue of *Kallimachos* is shown to be no more than a suspension of judgment, while Eratosthenes, who investigated the matter, pronounced in its favour. In several passages Herodotus has evidently made use of *Hekataios* (1) in the account of the island of Chemmis. Compare *Hdt.* ii. 156 with *Fr.* 284; (2) in the description of Egypt as δῶρον τοῦ ποταμοῦ which is found in *Fr.* 229; (3) compare *Hdt.* ii. 77 with *Fr.* 289-90. In these cases Herodotus is not to be called a plagiarist. It was usual to borrow without acknowledgment, and Herodotus seems to have travelled in Egypt with the *περιήγησις* in his hands as a guide-book, and to have refreshed his memory from it on his return, and this the more readily as the earlier portions of his work were probably prepared only as readings. A similar procedure with regard to other authors, of which some interesting examples are given, constitutes the so-called *ποικιλότης* of Herodot.

6. *Archaeologische Nachlese*, by C. Robert, contains (1) a description and discussion of the Atalanta group on the crater in the *Museo Civico*, at Bologna, of which a representation is given *Tav.* ii. A, B. in the last part of the *Museo Italiano di antichità classica*. It represents the Boeotian or Hesiodic version of the myth, and agrees in many details with Ovid, *Met.* x. 560-704; (2) a discussion of a small group of Pompeian pictures, of which three replicas are known (*Helbig*, 1391 b.; and 1381; and *Sogliano Pitt. mur.* 560), but which have hitherto been misunderstood. They are explained to represent Aeneas receiving the oracle of the foundation of Rome from the Sibyl of Marpesos; (3) The subject of three scenes on the lid of the Borghese sarcophagus is explained to be the birth of Apollo.

7. *Civitates Mundi and der Text der Ravennatischen Erdbeschreibung*, by J. W. Kubitschek. The former article deals with the notice from a Parisian codex of the 9th century 'sunt in hoc mundo civitates vnde xxvii.' This might either refer to the number of administrative units in the Roman empire, or it might be a calculation taken from some well-known map or geographical treatise. The latter is the most probable view. Neumann attempts to bring the statement into connection with the work of the chorographer

of Ravenna, from which however only about 3473 town-communities can be gleaned. On the other hand the tabular form of Ptolemy's Geography lends itself to summary calculations, and the number of towns and tribes in Books 2-7 amounts to 5675, *i.e.* within fifty of the statement in question. The latter article deals with the three MSS. of the chorographer of Ravenna (Vatic. Urbinas 961—A; Paris imp. 4794—B; and Bas. F. V. 6—C). These, from the nature of their mistakes, are clearly derived not from the archetype, but from some lost codex, while the closest relationship seems to exist between A and C, which are probably derived from the lost codex through an intermediate one, also lost.

Miscellen, Εὐπατρίδαι, by L. Toepfner. Isokrates, x. 25, says of the father of Alkibiades πρὸς μὲν ἀνδρῶν ἦν Εὐπατρίδων. Toepfner agrees with von Wilamowitz in explaining εὐπατρίδαι here as the name of a family, not of a class. This view is supported (1) by a comparison of the titles ἐξηγητὴς ἐξ εὐπατρίδων and ἐξηγητὴς ἐξ Εὐμολπίδων (2) by the words of Polemon τὸ τῶν εὐπατρίδων γένος. The passage of Plato *Alk.* i. 121 offers no real objection to this view.—*Die Sonnenfinsterniss vom Jahre*, 217 v. ch. The partial eclipse of the sun mentioned by Livy, xxii. 1-8, was that of Feb. 11, 217 B.C. From this it follows that the Ides of March, 537 A.U.C., the day on which the consul announced it, must have fallen a few days after Feb. 11, 217 B.C. Matzat's view, therefore, that it fell on Oct. 29, 218 B.C., and the common view that it fell in January, are both wrong.—*Terruncius*, by Th. Mommsen. This spelling of the word is found in an inscription from Hippo regius and thus confirms the best MSS. on Plaut. *Capt.* 477; Varr. *de l. Lat.* s. 174; Plin. *h. n.* 33, 3, 45, &c. The word, though Latin in form, in meaning = Greek *τριάς* = quadrans. It has been barbarised like *seena* and *epistula*.—*Recto oder verso?* by U. Wilcken. In dealing with opisthographi which have different texts on the two sides, it is important to know which is the earlier. Wilcken gives a test by which this may be at once decided. Each σελίς or pagina consists of two layers (*schide*), the lower one (as Pliny, *h. n.* xiii. 77 states) was placed in the manufacture with the fibres of the papyrus vertical to the workman (*in rectum*), the upper one with them horizontal (*transversa*). An examination of the papyrus rolls in the Berlin and London collections shows that where one side only is written on it is invariably the horizontal side, and where the text is on one side and merely the title on the other, the text is on the horizontal side; from this the rule is gained that the text on the horizontal side is always the oldest. This may be applied to existing collections with interesting results.—*Zu Cicero Epist.* v. 12, by E. Wölflin; and *Zu den Tempelbildern der Brauronia*, by F. Studniczka.

Wochenschrift für Klassische Philologie.—No. 21 (25 May): Fr. Ziemann, *De anathematis graecis* (M. Lelmerdt), contains more than the title promises.—R. Kayser, *De interpunctione graecarum inscriptionum* (Br. Keil) valuable for the material collected, but owing to its self-imposed limits inconclusive.—H. Gührer, *Musikgeschichtliches aus Homer I* (K. v. Jan.) will meet with universal approval and assent.—J. A. Heikel, *Βούλευσις in Mordprozessen* and W. Parson, *De crimine Βουλεύσεως* (S. Herrlich), both quite independently deny that *βούλευσις* = instigation was a subject for legal proceedings: neither is conclusive.—K. Schmidt, *De Herodico Crateteo* (F. Susemihl), an excellent piece of work.—G. Götz, *De Placidi glossis* (H. Hagen), a most valuable discovery.

No. 22 (1 June) L. Lange, *Kleine Schriften I* (H. Genz), gives a good idea of Lange's wide activity.—F. Bender, *Griech. Literatur* (K. Sittl) shows an acquaintance with the principal recent literature of the subject.—J. H. H. Schmidt, *Synonymik der griech. Sprache* iv (Ad. Matthias), concludes an adequate foundation for Greek 'synonymik.'—H. Hollander, *Ueberlieferung der Homer. Hymnen* (A. Gemoll), careful and excellent work. M. R. Cagnat, *Cours élémentaire d'épigraphie latine* (H. Hagen), such a practical manual is rarely met with.

No. 23 (8 June): *Les Musées d'Athènes*, publication de C. Rhomaïdès et P. Cavaddias (A. Trendelenburg), excellent photographs, brief texts, interesting matter, low price—a most welcome work.—*Homeri Hymni* etc. ed. E. Abel (A. Gemoll), one of the best of the Schenkl series.—E. Brey, *De Septem fabulae stasimo* ii, is made an occasion by J. Oberdick for arguing at length in favour of Paley's date of 'our Homer.'—J. Schedlbaur, *zur Textkritik von Lykurgs Leocratea* (H. Lewy) 37 emendations, of which 3 instructive, the rest erroneous.—Ac. Bährens, *Fragg. poetarum Romanorum* (J. M. Stowasser), a great advance on L. Müller's last work.—Meisser *Taciti Historiarum liber ii* (E. Wolff), careful, praiseworthy and up to the level of modern research.—C. Weyman, *Die Figur der Litotes* (J. H. Schmalz), work of the best and most sedulous description.

No. 24 (15 June): L. v. Urlichs *Archäologische Analekten* (P. W.), brief but rich in fine observations and combinations.—A. S. Miodoński, *De enuntiatis subjecto carentibus apud Hdt.* (W. Gemoll), carries conviction.—C. Schmelzer *Sophocles O. C.* (Fr. Schubert), full of errors.—J. Riehemann, *De litis instrumentis in Dem. orat. adv. Neaeram* (J. Kohm), rightly maintains that the 'instrumenta' are genuine.—F. Striller, *De Stoicorum studiis rhetoricis* (R. Volkmann), interesting and instructive.—G. Thilo *Vergili carmina* (W. Gebhardi) I.

No. 25 (22 June): J. H. Hansen *De Metallis Atticis I* (B. Büchschütz), the next part of this work may contain something of more importance than this.—*Xen's. Kyropädie* erkl. v. Hertlein. 4 Aufl. v. W. Nitsche (W. Vollbrecht), the revision of this standard edition is not consistent.—H. Viezl, *De Dem. in Androtionem et Timocratem oratt.* (J. Kohm), the first part contains nothing new; the second is not always convincing.—Thilo *Vergili Carmina* (W. Gebhardi) concluded, is recommended to scholars; while the text by itself would be better for schools than Ribbeck's.—J. S. Speijer, *Lanx satyra*, rightly maintains that 'Orcus' is a god and not also a place: the rest doubtful.—V. Hintner, *Meridies* (H. Ziemer) defends the old derivation, 'medidies' convincingly.

No. 26 (29 June): V. Urbanitzky, *Elektrizität u. Magnetismus im Altertum* (C. P. Schmidt); a model piece of work.—A. Holder, *Herodoti hist. lib. v.* (W. Gemoll) attributes too much importance to v.—Chr. Cron, *Platons Gorgias*, 4A. (K. J. Liebhold), a useful school-edition.—L. Friedländer, *Martial* (E. Hübner) I., descriptive review.—M. Hertz, *Gellius*, ed. min., 'exhibeo Noctes Atticas multo emendatiores quam in priore factum est' sums it up.

No. 27 (6 July), J. Toepffer, *Quaestiones Pisistrateae*, (Holm), shows discernment and learning but is not always convincing.—Rud. Schoell, *Procli Commentar. in rempublicam Platonis* (R. Reitzenstein) contains many satisfactory emendations.—C. Walther, *Imitationis Thucydideae vestigia in Demosth. oratt.* (J. Kohm) denies the imitation very learnedly, but who believes in it?—E. M. Schranka, *Der Stoiker Epiktet* (Kvuszewski), useful if the mistakes are discounted.—L. Friedländer, *Martial* (E. Hübner) concluded.

No. 28 (13 July, : J. C. Morgenthau, *Bilder auf griech. Vasen I.* (W—r), praiseworthy.—A. Rzach,

Homeri Ilias, ii. (F. Week), a long and unfavourable review.—P. Uhle, *De Oratt. Demostheni falso addictarum scriptt.* ii. (H. Lewy) contains a certain amount of probability.—A. Kopp, *De Ammoni Eranii all. distinctionibus synonym.* (K. Zacher), an addition to science.

No. 29—30 (20 July): E. Hesselmeier, *Die Ursprünge der Stadt Pergamos* (E. Fabricius), in the main right, but contains many errors.—E. Schneider, *Dialectorum Italicarum exempla* (W. Deecke) a selection carefully and cleverly done.—M. Zöller, *Röm. Staats u. Rechtsaltertümer* (F. Ammann), a compendium is wanted, but whether this book will satisfy the need is doubtful.—Fr. Slameczka, *Demosthenes von der Gesandtschaft* (R. Busse), clear and copious, but his results in detail are hardly certain.—J. Müller, *Tacitus II.* (W. Wartenberg) establishes a claim on our gratitude.—F. Boelte, *De artium scriptoribus Latinis* (J. Golling) seems convincing.—J. Mähly, *Zur kritik lateinischer Texte*, a noteworthy contribution to Latin criticism.—J. Huemer, *Virgilii grammatici opera* (G. Schultz), a firm foundation for further research.

No. 31 (3 Aug.): A. Böekh, *Encyclopädie u. Methodologie der philolog. Wissenschaften*, 2 Aufl. (H. Heller) still very valuable.—H. Weil, *Aeschylus* (J. Oberdick) I, deserves to become the standard edition. Heinsch, *Comment. Euripidearum spec.* is reviewed by K. Busche in detail.—J. Sommerbrodt, *Lucian* (Nils Nilen) has not made the best use of his materials and opportunity.

No. 32—33 (17 Aug.): H. Weil, *Aeschylus II.* (J. Oberdick) continued.—Bauer-Wecklein, *Euripides' Herakliden* (L. Tachau), a handy edition for beginners. Th. Zielinski *Die Märchenkomödie in Athen* (K. Zacher), a long and on the whole not unfavourable review.—E. A. Junghahn, *Studien zu Thukydides* (S. Widmann), too polemical.—Fr. Cramer, *De perfectivi conjunctivi usu potentiali* (G. Landgraf), a valuable contribution to our knowledge of old Latin.—Curschmann *Horatiana* (P. Dettweiler), a tilt against windmills.—Deppe, *Kriegszüge des Tiberius* (F. Violet), amounts to little.—Gertz, *Senecae dialogi* (W. Gemoll), an advance.

No. 34 (24 Aug.): Weil, *Aeschylus* (Oberdick) concluded.—Chr. Ziegler *Euripides' Iphig. bei d. Tauriern* (Wecklein), contains what is most necessary.—Poppo-Stahl, *Thucydides I.* (J. Steup), a service to Thu.—W. Deecke, *Die italischen Sprachen* (H. Ziemer), very condensed but excellent.—G. M. Richardson, *De dum partie.* (G. Landgraf) shows acquaintance with the literature of the history of Latin.

No. 35 (31 Aug.): A. Schneider, *Der troische sagenkreis*, and J. Vogel *Scenen euripideischer Tragödien* (P. Weizsäcker) I.—C. Forsman, *De Aristarcho lex. Apolloniani fonte* (F. Roellig), deserves attention.—H. Meusel, *Lex. Caesarianum IV.* favourably reviewed by A. Neitzert.—A. Kiessling, *Horatius II. Satiren.* (E. Rosenberg), has some strong lights—and some strong shadows.—H. Planer, *De haud et haudquaquam* (G. Landgraf) does us a praiseworthy service.

No. 36 (7 Sep.): Schneider, *troischer sagenkreis*, indispensable; and J. Vogel, *Scenen euripid. Tragödien*, cautious and welcome (P. Weizsäcker, conclusion). Pauly—C. Wotke, *Homeri Odysseae epitome* (P. Cauer) an advance on Pauly.—O. Perthes, *Die platonische Schrift Menexenus* (K. J. Liebhold), careful and cautious, but not of course final.—P. Dettweiler, *Symbolae ad collocationem verborum* (G. Landgraf), instructive.

Rivista di Philologia e d'Istruzione Classica, ed. Comparetti, Müller and Flechia. (Turin. 1887). Fascicolo 7-8 contains (1) *On the Catalogue of the Nereids in Hesiod's Theogony*, by V. Puntoni. Sug-

gestions on the best mode of filling the list with fifty names without retaining lines 252-254. (2) *On the VI. Pythian and II. Isthmian Odes*, by G. Fraccaroli. Chiefly a literary study, accompanied by two verse-translations in the original metres. (3) *On the Ecclesiastusac and Plato's Republic*, by B. Chiappelli. Contending that the equality of women with men was Plato's doctrine, ridiculed by Aristophanes, and that the opening pages of *Rep. V.* are an answer to the comedy. (4) *De Timaei Historici Vita*, by G. M. Columba. Contending that Timaeus was born at Syracuse, not at Tauromenium, and that he was born not earlier than 340 B.C. and was exiled not later than 317 B.C. (5) Notices of some translations, abstracts of periodicals and obituary of German scholars.

Fascicolo 9-10 consists chiefly of a *Rassegna Critica* by E. Cocchia, a miscellaneous collection of criticisms on recent books, among which Seelmann's *Aussprache des Latein* occupies the most space. A few brief reviews follow, one of which (by G. Morosi) calls attention to what is apparently a singularly interesting work. This is *Iacconti Greci di Roccaforte*, collected by E. Capialbi and L. Bruzzano (Monteleone, 1886). The present notice is of the second part, the notice of the first having appeared early last year, and it unfortunately gives no account of the book, which seems to be a collection of Calabrian tales of Greek origin in a dialect which is very largely infused with Greek.

Fascicolo 11-12 contains (1) *On the offering of raiment in Attic funeral rites*, by F. M. Pasanisi,

calling attention to the early Greek belief in a life beyond the grave, which began nine days after interment. (2) *On the letter of Alexander the Great to Aristotle De Mirabilibus Indiæ* by R. Sabbadini, pointing out that there are two Latin versions of the letter, one of which (sometimes attributed to Corn. Nepos) is certainly very old and contains some curious Latin, as *semisopor*, *bestiosus*, *impingere aliquem poena*. (3) Notices of a number of German books, giving an account of their contents, almost always with high praise. (4) Index to vol. xv.

Kuhn's Zeitschrift, xxix. 3 and 4 :—

L. v. Schröder. 'Ἀπόλλων is identical with Sk. *saparyenya* 'who is to be honoured,' an epithet of Agni in the Rigveda. The attributes of Agni and Apollo are shewn to be identical.—W. Schulze. (1) *ἰαχον* in Homer sometimes must, always can be, aorist. We should write not *ἐν πρώτοις ἰάχων* but *ἐν πρώτοισι φαχών*, μέγα *FFάχον* &c. the root being *srēgh*, in Anglo-Sax. *swōgan* to roar. (2) *ἄιον* is also aor. in meaning, from rt. *avis* in *ἄφισ-θεσθαι*, *audio* (*aviz-dio*) &c.—Miscellen. by W. Schulze. The most interesting are *ἄρεος ἀλκτῆρα* (Ξ 485) not connected with *ἀλέξω* but *i. q.* Latin *ullor* = *volctor*.—*ἀμνιον* (γ. 444) = *σαμβιον*. Lat. *sanguen*. δ. 705, read *ἔσκετο* (not *ἔσχετο*) for *σε-σκε-το* Sk. *sa-sc-at* 'hindrance'.—*νηλεές ἡμαρ* not from *ἐλεος* but *ἀλέφομαι*.—*ἀλέγεω* = *η-legein*, weakest form of prepos. *ἐν*.—F. Solmsen concludes his account of *σ* in combination with liquids and nasals in Greek.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

BOOKS PUBLISHED IN ENGLAND.

- Aeschylus*. Prometheus Vincetus, with notes by M. G. Glazebrook. 12mo. pp. 38. 107. Rivingtons. 2s. 6d.
- Aristophanes*. The Knights. With introduction and notes by W. W. Merry. 12mo. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 3s.
- Cicero*. Pro A. Cluentio Oratio. With explanatory and critical notes by W. Yorke Fausset. Post 8vo. pp. 350. London, Rivingtons. 6s.
- Cato Major et Laelius. With an introduction and commentary by Professor Austin Stickney. 12mo. New York. 5s.
- Demosthenes*. Orations against Philip. With introductions and notes by Evelyn Abbott and P. E. Matheson. 12mo. 80. 64 pp. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 3s.
- Homer*. Odyssey. Done into English verse by William Morris. (2 vols.) Vol. 2. 4to. pp. 450. Boards. Reeves and Turner. 12s.
- Lysias*. Epitaphios. Edited with introduction and notes by F. J. Snell. 12mo. 43. 40 pp. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 2s.

- Mahaffy* (J. P.) Greek life and thought, from the age of Alexander to the Roman Conquest. Crown 8vo. pp. xxxviii. 600. Macmillan. 12s. 6d.
- St. Paul's* First Epistle to the Corinthians, with a Critical and Grammatical Commentary by C. J. Ellicott, D.D. 8vo. xxiv. 334 pp. London. Longmans. 10s. 6d.
- Plato*. The Apology. With introduction and notes by St. George Stock. 12mo. 68. 51 pp. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 2s.
- Pliny*. Select Letters. With notes for use of schools, by the late Constantine E. Prichard and Edward R. Bernard. New edition. 12mo. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 3s.
- Sargent* (John Young). Easy passages for translation into Latin. 7th edition. 12mo. pp. 170. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 2s. 6d.
- Virgil* in English Verse, Eclogues and Aeneid i.—vi. by the Right Hon. Sir Charles Bowen. pp. 11. 305. Murray. 12s.
- Xenophon*. Anabasis. Book I. and II. with notes and vocabulary. 12mo. London, Rivingtons. 1s. each.

BOOKS PUBLISHED ON THE CONTINENT.

- Abhandlungen, Breslauer philologische. Band 2 Heft 2. 8vo. Breslau. Köbner. 1 Mk. 80. *Cohn* (L.) Zu den Paroemiographen. Mittheilungen aus Handschriften. 86 pp.
- Arbois de Jubainville* (H. d') Exemples de noms de fundi formés à l'aide de Gentilices romains et du suffixe 'aens.' (*Extr. Bibl. de l'école des chartes*.) 8vo. 15 pp.
- Barwinski* (B.) Quaestiones ad Dracontium et Orestis tragoediam pertinentes. Quaestio I. De genere

- dicendi. 8vo. 109 pp. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht. 2 Mk.
- Birt* (Th.) De Romae urbis nomine sive de robore romano. 4to. 17 pp. Marburg. Elwert. 1 Mk.
- Brugmann* (O.) Ueber den Gebrauch des condicionalen NI in der älteren Latinität. Nicolai-Gymn. zu Leipzig. 34 S.
- Brochard* (V.) Les Sceptiques Grecs. 8vo. 432 pp. Paris. F. Alcan. 8 fres.

- Busche* (C.) *Observationes criticae in Euripidis Troades*. 8vo. 48 pp. Göttingen. Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht. 80 Pf.
- Chaignet* (A. E.) *Histoire de la Psychologie des Grecs*. Tome I. *Histoire de la Psychologie des Grecs avant et après Aristote*. 8vo. xxii. 426 pp. Paris. Hachette and Co. 7 fr. 50.
- Cicero*. *Orationes selectae XVIII. Ex recognitione Halmis*. Pars. I. *Orationes pro S. Roscio Amerino*, in Q. Caecilium, in Verrem. Lib. IV. et V., de imperio Cn. Pompei, in L. Catilinam continens. 8vo. 204 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. 1 Mk.
- Corpus inscriptionum atticarum consilio et auctoritate academiae litterarum regiae borussicae editum*. Vol. quarti supplementa complexi partis I. fasc. 2; supplementorum Vol. I. partem 2 continens. Fol. pp. 57–132. Berlin. G. Reimer. 7 Mk.
- Dissertationes philologicae Halenses*. Vol. VIII. 8vo. iii. 292 pp. Halle. Niemeyer. 7 Mk. (I.–VIII. Mk. 62.)
- Dittenberger* (W.) *De sacris Rhodiorum II*. Halle. 16 S.
- Eberhard*. *Eberhardi Bethuniensis Graecismus ad fidem librorum manu scriptorum recensuit, lectionum varietatem adiecit, indices locupletissimos et imaginem codicis Melicensis photolithographicam addidit J. Wrobel*. 8vo. xx. 317 pp. Breslau. Köbner. 9 Mk.
- Elfis* (A.) *Aristotelis doctrina de mente humana ex commentariorum graecorum sententiis eruta*. Pars I. *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis et Joannis Grammatici Philoponi commentationes continens*. 8vo. 47 pp. Bonn. Strauss. 2 Mk.
- Epicurea* edidit H. Usener. 8vo. lxxviii. 445 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 16 Mk.
- Faltin* (G.) *Ueber den Ursprung des zweiten punischen Krieges*. Gymn. zu Neu-Ruppin. 20 S.
- Feldmann* (J.) *Observationes ad L. A. Senecam criticae*. Gymn. zu Ostrowo. 26 S.
- Fritzsche* (F. V.) *Coniectanea*. II. *De numeris dochmiacis*, fasc. 8 Rostock. 8 S.
- Gehrke* (A.) *Vorstufen christlicher Weltanschauung im Altertum*. Gymn. zu Rudolstadt. 34 S.
- Gehrmann* (A.) *Incunabula incrementaque proprietatum sermonis Valerii Maximi*. I. Gymn. zu Rüssel. 24 S.
- Geppert* (P.) *Zum Monumentum Ancyranum*. Gymn. zum Grauen Kloster in Berlin. 18 S.
- Grumme* (A.) *Ciceronis orationis Murenianae dispositio*. 8vo. 16 pp. Gera. Kanitz. 40 Pf.
- Gruppe* (O.) *Die griechischen Culte und Mythen in ihren Beziehungen zu den orientalischen Religionen*. Band I. *Einleitung*. 8vo. xviii. 706 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 16 Mk.
- Hagen* (M.) *Quaestiones criticae de bello Mutinensi*. 8vo. 53 pp. Marburg. Elwert. 1 Mk. 20.
- Handbuch der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* herausg. von Iwan Müller. Halbband VI. (complete Vol. IV. part I.) *Bauer* (A.) *Griechische Kriegsaltertümer*. Müller (I.) *Griechische Privataltertümer*. Pp. 226–480. Beck. Nordlingen. Mk. 7.
- Herzog* (E.) *Geschichte und System der römischen Staatsverfassung*. Vol. II. *Die Kaiserzeit von der Diktatur Cäsars bis zum Regierungsantritt Diocletians*. Part I. *Geschichtliche Uebersicht*. 8vo. xxii. 602 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 10 Mk.
- Homer*. *Odysee*. Erklärt von J. U. Faesi. Band 4. *Gesang*. XVIII.–XXIV. 7. Aufl. besorgt von Dr. J. Renner. 8vo. 232 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. 1 Mk. 80.
- Horace*. *Oeuvres traduites en vers français par Aug. de Bors*. Illustrations de Paul Avril. 16mo. 457 pp. Paris.
- Hoyer* (R.) *Alkibiades Vater und Sohn in der Rhetorenschule*. Gymn. zu Kreuznach. 20 S.
- Hülsem* (Ch.) *Ein Monument des vatikanischen Museums*. Progm. zu Grosz-Lichterfelde. 12 S. mit 1 Tafel.
- Hultsch* (F.) *Scholien zur Sphaerik des Theodosius mit 22 Fig.* (Extract from Abhandlungen der k. Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften). Roy. 8vo. 66 pp. Leipzig. Hirzel. 3 Mk. 60.
- Kock* (Th.) *Flores Italici*. 16mo. 177 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. Mk. 2 40.
- Lange* (L.) *Kleine Schriften aus dem Gebiete der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft*. 2 Vols. 8vo. xl. 429 & 641 pp. Göttingen. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 15 Mk.
- Lautensach*. *Verballexicon der attischen Inschriften*. Gymn. Ernestinum zu Gotha. 26 S.
- Müller* (F.) *Historisch-etymologische Studien über mathematische Terminologie*. Luisen-Gymn. zu Berlin. 32 S.
- Mangold* (B.) *La ville Homérique*. Franz. Gymn. in Berlin. 20 S.
- Marquardt* (I.) *Mommsen* (Th.) *Handbuch der römischen Alterthümer*. Band 3. Abth. 1. 8vo. Leipzig. Hirzel. 15 Mk. (i.–iii. 1., iv.–vii. 100 Mk.) *Römisches Staatsrecht* von Th. Mommsen. Band 3. Abth. 1 (xviii. 832 pp.)
- Maschke* (M.) *Der Freiheitsprozess im klassischen Altertum insbesondere der Prozess um Verginia*. 8vo. xii. 191 pp. Berlin. Gaertner.
- Maué* (Dr. H. C.) *Der Praefectus fabrum*. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des römischen Beamtenthums und des Collegialwesens während der Kaiserzeit. Mit einem Anhang enth. die Inschriften 8vo. xii. 190 pp. Halle. Niemeyer. 5 Mk.
- Omont* (H.) *Fac-similes de Manuscrits Grecs des x^e et xvi^e siècles*. 4to. 15, 50 plates. Paris. Picard. 12 fr. 50 c.
- Opuscula Philologica*. *Mindre Afhandlinger udgivne af det philologisk-historiske Samfund*. 8vo. 271 pp. Kjobenhavn. Klein. 5 kr.
- Petri* (F.) *De enuntiatorum condicionalum apud Aristophanem formis et usu*. 8vo. 62 pp. Berlin. Mayer & Müller. 1 Mk. 20.
- Richter* (R.) *Materialien zur Begriffsbestimmung des Orbis terrarum*. Köln. Gymn. zu Leipzig. 8. 40 S.
- Rothenberg* (A.) *Die häusliche und öffentliche Erziehung bei den Römern*. Gymn. zu Prenzlau. 16 S.
- Schmid* (W.) *Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern von Dionysius von Halikarnass bis auf den zweiten Philostratus*. Band i. 8vo. xix. 432 pp. Stuttgart. Kohlhammer. 6 Mk.
- (L.) *Quaestionis de Pindaricorum carminum chronologia supplementum alterum*. Marburg. 10 S.
- Schubert* (R.) *Geschichte des Agathokles*. 8vo. vi. 210 pp. Breslau. Köbner. 5 Mk.
- Serre* (Contre-Amiral). *Études sur l'histoire militaire et maritime des Grecs et des Romains*. 12mo. xii. 270 pp. Paris. Baudoin. 3 frs.
- Sotiriadis* (G.) *Zur Kritik des Johannes von Antiochia* (*Extr. Jahr. f. klass. Phil.*) 8vo. 127 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 3 Mk. 20.
- Stahl* (J. M.) *De hyporchemate amoebaeo quod est in Euripidis Cyclope*. Münster. 13 S.
- Steiger* (H.) *De versuum paeonicorum et dochmiacorum apud poetas graecos usu ac ratione*. Part ii. 4to. 30 pp. Leipzig. Fock. Mk. 1 (i. & ii. 2 Mk. 50).
- Stern* (E.) *Xenophon's Hellenika und die Bootische Geschichtsüberlieferung*. 8vo. 71 pp. Dorpat. Karow. 1 Mk. 80.
- Studemund* (W.) *Menandri et Philistionis comparatio cum appendicibus*. Breslau. 41 S.
- Tannery* (P.) *Pour l'histoire de la science Hellène. De Thalès à Empedocle*. 8vo. vii. 397 pp. Paris. Alcan. 7 frs. 50.

Tämpel (K.) Bemerkungen zu einigen Fragen der griechischen Religionsgeschichte. Gymn. zu Neustettin. 23 S.

—Die Aithiopenländer des Andromedamythos. Studien zur Rhodischen Colonisation. (*Extr.* Jahrb. für class. Philologie Svo. Pp. 120-220. Leipzig. Teubner. 2 Mk. 40.

Fahlen (J.) De quibusdam orationis ornatae methodis apud poetas graecos et latinos. Berlin. 8 S.

—In Euripidis Electram coniectanea. Berlin. 13 S.

Voigt (M.) Ueber die Bankiers, die Buchführung und

die Literalobligation der Römer. (*Extr.* Abhandl. der k. Sächs. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften). Roy. Svo. 66 pp. Leipzig, Hirzel. 3 Mk.

Weissbrodt (W.) De versionibus Scripturae Sacrae latinis. I. Braunsberg. 18 S.

Wilisch (E.) Beiträge zur inneren Geschichte des alten Korinth. Gymn. zu Zittau. 34 S.

Wrede (F.) De praepositione *eis*. Gymn. an Aposteln zu Köln. 15 S.

Zinzow (A.) Der Vaterbegriff bei den römischen Gottheiten. Gymn. zu Pyritz. 18 S.

UNIVERSITY INTELLIGENCE.

(Continued from page 314.)

OXFORD UNIVERSITY.

UNIVERSITY SCHOLARSHIP.—Kennicott (Hebrew). Senior: D. S. Margoliouth, M.A., New College (Winchester). Junior: T. Walker, Wadham (Trin. Coll. Dublin). Pusey and Ellerton (Hebrew): J. F. Stenning, Wadham (Merchant Taylors); C. J. Burney, S. John's (Merchant Taylors). *Proo. Acc.*: H. B. Lindsell, Trinity (Harrow).

COLLEGES.

EXETER.—Cl. Exh.: R. F. C. de Winton, Marlborough; J. N. Newland Smith, S. Paul's.

ALL SOULS.—Fellow (Law): R. A. Shepherd, Trinity (Sedburgh).

MAGDALEN.—Demies (Nat. Sci.): R. W. T. Günther, Univ. Coll. School; C. E. Stainer, S. Paul's; A. J. H. Mowbray, Radley.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY.

UNIVERSITY PRIZES.—Smith's Prizes: A. E. H. Love, S. John's (Wolverhampton); A. Berry, King's (Croydon, Univ. Coll. School, and Univ. Coll. London). Balfour Biological Student: W. Bateson, S. John's (Rugby).

COLLEGES.

St. JOHN'S.—Fellows (Cl.): E. J. Rapson, Hereford; J. L. A. Paton, Shrewsbury; (Math.) W. C. Fletcher, Kingswood.

PETERHOUSE.—Scholars (Math.): A. E. Daniels, Leicester; R. T. Robinson, Univ. Coll. Bangor; (Cl.) N. C. Craig, Bedford.

SCHOLARSHIPS ANNOUNCED.

OXFORD (all Classical).—Merton: exam. begins, Jan. 10; prob. number of scholarships, two or three, one exh.; names to be given in by Jan. 10. S. John's: exam. begins, Jan. 10; prob. number of scholarships, two; names to be given in by Jan. 10. Jesus: exam. begins, Jan. 10; prob. number of scholarships, two; names to be given in by Jan. 10. Pembroke: exam. begins, Jan. 10; prob. number of scholarships, two; names to be given in by Jan. 10.

CAMBRIDGE.—Trinity: exam. begins, Dec. 7; prob. number of scholarships, about twenty, and exh.; subjects, cl. math. mor. sci. and nat. sci.; S. John's: exam. begins, Dec. 8; prob. number of scholarships, ten, and exh.; subjects, cl. Hebrew, and Sanskrit; names to be given in by Dec. 1. S. John's: exam. begins, Dec. 13; subjects, math. and nat. sci.; names to be given in by Dec. 1. King's: exam. begins, Dec. 8; prob. number of scholarships, four Eton; two open, and exh.; subjects, cl. math. nat. sci. and hist.; names to be given in by Dec. 3. Caius: exam. begins, Dec. 10; prob. number of scholarships, six or more, and exh.; subjects, cl. math. and nat. sci.; names to be given in by Dec. 1. Christ's: exam. begins, Jan. 3; prob. number of scholarships about seven or eight; subjects, cl. math. and nat. sci. Emmanuel: exam. begins, Jan. 3; prob. number of scholarships, five; subjects, cl. and math.; names to be given in by Dec. 30. Queen's: exam. begins, Jan. 12; prob. number of scholarships, six; subjects, cl. and math.; name to be given in by Jan. 6. Clare: exam. begins, Mar. 14; prob. number of scholarships, six; subjects, cl. math. and nat. sci.; names to be given in by Mar. 10. Trin. Hall: exam. begins, Mar. 15; prob. number of scholarships, six; subjects, cl. and math.; names to be given in by Mar. 8. Magdalene: exam. begins, Mar. 15; prob. number of scholarships, three; subjects, cl. and math.; names to be given in by Mar. 10.

INDEX

BY

W. F. R. SHILLETO, M.A.,

FORMERLY SCHOLAR OF CHRIST'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

- Aarau fragments of Juvenal, 17*b*.
 Abbott's (T. K.) note on a bas-relief of Demosthenes, 313*b*.
 notice of *Lexicons* to the *Greek Testament*, 106 foll.
 notice of *Studia Biblica*, 194 foll., 268-9.
 Abel's *Homeri Hymni Epigrammata Batrachomyomachia*, 198-9.
 Orphica, 270-1.
 'Ablautsreihen,' 64*b*.
 Abrahall's (J. Hoskyns) note on Verg. *Aen.* ix. (715), 169*b*.
 Adam's *Platonis Apologia Socratis*, 71.
 ἀείδω, 259*a*.
 Aeneid, order of composition, 181*a*.*b*.
 Aeolic element in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, 35 foll., 91 foll.
 Aeschylus, *Agam.* (331), 204*a*.
 Agam. (1227ff. ; 1310), 241*b*.
 Eum. (631*f*.), 313*a*.
 Seven against Thebes, Verrall's, 50 foll.
 [See also under 'Greek Writers.']
 ἀγορὰ Κερκώπων, 3*b*.
 ἀγοράζω = ἐν ἀγορᾷ διατρίβω (Schol. on Ar. *Achar.* 625), *ib*.
 = πρίων (Hesychius), *ib*.
 ἀγώνοθέτης, functions of the, 297*b*.
 agri fiscales, 267*b*.
 αἰζηλος (αἰδηλος), 36*b*.
 ἄιον, 322*b*.
 αἰσυμνήτης, 36*a*.
 Aithiopenländer des Andromedamythos, Tümpel's, 318-19.
 Akarnania, Ambrakia, &c., Oberhummer's, 279.
Album Paléographique, 145 foll.
 Alcaic metre, 92*b*.
 Alciphron's *Epistles* quoted, 108*b*.
 ἀλεγέω, 322*b*.
 Alexander's Empire, Mahaffy's, 203-4.
 Alexandria, discovery of an early Christian cemetery near (*Times*, 4 May), 177.
 Allen and Greenough's *Latin Grammar*, 125*b*.
 Allen's (F. A.) theory on the origin of the Epic metre, 92*a*.
alta Prochyta in Vergil, 169*b*.
 altaria = 'offerings,' 295*b*.
 Altgriechischer Versbau, Usener's, 162-3.
 Amiatinus codex, 84*a*.
 ἄμμες, ἄμμι, ἄμμε, 35*b*., 37*b*.
 ἄμμιον (*Od.* iii. 444), 322*b*.
 ἄμνδῖς and ἄλλνδῖς, 35*b*.
 simul, 87*a*.
 ἀμύμων, 36*a*.
 ἀνεμίζω, 109.
 Antioch, ancient remains at, 81*a*.
 Anti-Pelagian Treatises of S. Augustine, three, Woods and Johnston's, 235.
 -αο and -αων, the genitive terminations, 37*a*., 91*a*.
 ἀπειλήτην (*Od.* xi. 313), 36*a*.
 ἄποινα, ἀποιναῖν (cp. Homeric ποινή), 219*a*.*b*.
 Apocalypse, Vischer's hypothesis of the, 212*b*.
 Völter's analysis of the, *ib*.
 ἀποκέρυξῖς, 165*a*.
 Ἀπόλλων, 322*b*.
 Apollonius Rhodius, his use of the word γλυφίδες, 244*b*.
 the Κτίσεις of, the possible original of Cato's *Origines*, 7*a*.
 [See also under 'Greek Writers.']
 Apostolical Constitutions, 302*b*.
 Appendix Vergiliana, Max Sonntag's, 306-7.
 Appian *Maced.* xi. 7, 8, compared with Livy xlii. 17, 170.
 Apsyrtus, 243*a*.
 ἀπνέσθω (cp. ἡπύω), 92*a*.
 Aquae Sulis, 299*a*.
 Aratus' poem founded on Eudoxus' Φαινόμενα, 272*b*.
 arbiter, etymology of, 87*a*.
 Arcadian inscriptions, Homeric words found in, 92*a*.
 Archaeological Institute and Association publications, 298*a*.
 Archaeology and Criticism &c., Essays in Biblical, by Oxonians, 194 foll., 268-9.
 Reports on, 25, 80, 117, 171, 209, 248, 285, 314.
 [See also under 'British Museum,' 'Excavations,' 'Summaries.']
 Archaic Fibulae with Incised Designs, 115*b*.
 Greek Vase in the British Museum, 315-16.
 Greek Metre, experiments in, 168.
 Archer-Hind (R. D.) on the late Master of Trinity as a Platonic Scholar, 33 foll.
 Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie, an appeal in behalf of, 227-8.
 [See also under 'Summaries.']
 ἀργειφόντης, 36*a*.
 ἀργεννός, 35*a*.
 ἀρειή, 280.
 ἄρεος ἀλκτῆρα (*Il.* xiv. 485), 322*b*.
 Argolica of Deinias (or Agias), 102*b*.
 Arimaspeia of Aristeas, the, 300*b*.
 Aristophanes, *Achar.* 36, note on, 115: cp. p. 3.
 Achar. 100, note on, 204.

- Aristophanes, Blaydes', 96 foll.
Plutus, the scholia on, 78, 242.
Ran. 209, note on, 20.
Vesp. 355, note on, 204.
[See also under 'Greek Writers.']
Aristophanica, 128 foll. : cp. p. 313.
Aristotle, Fragments of, 205.
Nicomachean Ethics, Stock's, 152.
πολιτεία Ἀθηναίων, the recently-discovered papyrus-fragment, 53b., 228b.
Politics, new materials for text, 20-1.
Rhetoric, Welldon's, 98 foll.
[See also under 'Greek Writers.']
Arnold (E. V.) on Caesar's Bridge over the Rhine, 168-9.
on Caesar's Speech in behalf of the Catilinarians, 169.
Arnold's Second Punic War, edited by W. T. Arnold, 109-10.
Artemidorus and Eratosthenes, the chief geographical authorities of Pausanias, 103a.
ἀρτιασμός, 170a.b.
Arval Brothers, Hymn of the, 164a.
'asphodel,' the Homeric, 238b.
Assarlik, excavations at, 81-2.
ἀσπὸς and αὐτός, 280a.
Astragalizontes of Polyeletus, 170.
ἀσπράγαλοι, games with, *ib.*
Athenian Democracy, Development of, Jevons', 58 foll.
Public Economy, Boeckh's, 149 foll.
Attic Law of Guardianship, Schulthess', 165.
Tribes, the four old, 228b.
ἀνέρυσαν, 35b.
Augustine (St.), *Civitas Dei*, 5.
Excerpts from the writings of, Knoell's, 139 foll.
Latinity of, Regnier's, 235-6.
Speculum, the so-called, 140a., 268a.
three Treatises—*De Spiritu et Littera*; *De Natura et Gratia*; *De Gestis Pelagii*—translated by Woods and Johnston, 235.
translation of the works of, Holmes', 235b.
[See also under 'Latin Writers.']
αἰλαχοί, 35b.
Ausonius, Peiper's, 75.
Austrian Staff Maps of Greece, 279.
Avellino's *De argento Rubastino*, 173b.
Avianus' *Fables*, Cannegieter's, 188-9.
Robinson Ellis', 188 foll.
Babington's (Churchill) edition of Hyperides' *Funeral Oration*, 39.
facsimile editions of Hyperides' *Orationes for Lycophron* and *against Demosthenes respecting the treasure of Harpalus*, *ib.*
Babrius' *Aesop's Fables*, 47b.
Babylonian and Assyrian sexagesimal system, 172.
Baehrens' *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum*, 74.
M. Minucii Felici Octavius, 75.
Baldwin Brown's *From Schola to Cathedral*, *ib.*
Ball's *Animals and Plants of India* referred to, 244b.
Bankes' Homer in the British Museum (Papyrus exiv.) collation of, by G. C. Lewis, 39.
Barrett (Dr.), 116a.
Barthold's *Euripides, Medea*, 135.
basilica, 75b.
Baumeister's *Denkmäler des Klassischen Altertums*, 202-3.
Beau de Fouquières' *Jour des Anciens* quoted, 170b.
Bede, *H. E.* (i. 17; iii. 15), quoted, 245.
Beloch's *Die Bevölkerung der griechisch-römischen Welt*, 164-5.
Bender's *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, 19.
benedictio (= 'relics'), 227b.
Bent (J. T.) notice of the Thasiote Tombs (with *n.* by C. T.), 209-10. : cp. p. 318.
Bergk's *Kleine philologische Schriften*—Band II. *Zur Griechischen Literatur*—234-5.
Berne *Commenta* on Lucan, 294-5.
Bethe's *Mythology of Diodorus*, 273.
Bevölkerung der griechisch-römischen Welt, Beloch's 164.
Bezenberger's *Beiträge zur Kunde der Indogerm. Sprachen*. Vol. xi. 'Die Sprachform der altonischen und altattischen Lyrik,' A. Fick, 35 foll., 91 foll.
bharā, bharāmi, φέρω, &c., 264b.
Bible of Theodulf of Orleans, of the ninth century, 147a.
revision of German, 84a.
Biblical Archaeology and Criticism &c., Essays in, by Oxonians, 191 foll., 268-9.
Commentaries, query on, 205.
Bibliography :—
(a) New Books published in England, 30, 88, 122, 182, 214, 260, 291, 322.
(b) New Books published on the Continent, 31, 88, 122, 182, 214, 260, 292, 322.
βιβλιοπωλαί in the ὀρχήστρα, 150b., 297b.
Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum, ed. C. Schenkl :¹
Herodoti Historiae. Recensuit A. Holder (Vol. I. Libr. i.-iv.), 156.
Herodoti Historiarum, Libr. v.-vi. *Scholium* in usum edidit A. Holder, 156-7.
M. Fabi Quintiliani institutionis oratoriae libri duodecim, Meister's (vols. i. ii.), 155-6.
M. Tulli Ciceronis libri qui ad rem publicam et ad philosophiam spectant, Schiche's (vols. ix. x.), 135-6.
Orationes selectae, Nohl's (vols. i.-ii.), *ib.*
Orphica, recensuit Eugenius Abel, 270-1.
Ovidii Carminum selecta, Sedlmayer's, 157.
Ovidii Fasti, Tristia, Ibis, ex Ponto, Halieutica, Fragmenta, Gütthling's, *ib.*
Metamorphoses, Zingerle's, *ib.*
"Black-eyed Susan," Graece redditum, 76.
Blass' *Eudoxi ars astronomica*, (ed. 2), 272.
Blaydes' *Aristophanes*, text (2 vols.), 96 foll.
Boeckh's *Die Staatshaushaltung der Athener*, 149 foll.
Boelte's *De Artium Scriptoribus Latinis*, 278-9.
Bond and Walpole's *Caesar, Bell. Gall.*, 233.
Bonitz' *Platonische Studien*, 232-3.
Bopp and his school of Philology, 264a.
Bourne's (Vincent) Latin verses, 48a.
Boyes' (J. F.) *Illustrations of the Greek Tragedians*, 74a.
brachium, orthography of, 74b.
Bradley (H.), in the *Academy*, Jan. 30, 1886, 127b.
Briefwechsel des Beatus Rhenanus, Horowitz and Hartfelder's, 167.
Briel's *De Callistrato et Philonide*, 273.
British Museum acquisitions, 26, 80, 117 176 209 249, 286, 316.
antiquities from Karpathos, 27.
antiquities from Majorca, 316, 317.
antiquities from Sesto Calende, 81.
antiquities from tombs at Thebes, 316.
archaic Greek vase, 315.
architecture, 26.
arrangement, 176, 186.
bronzes, 117.
casts from the Chaeroneia lion, 317.
catalogue of Greek coins, 248.

¹ For other issues in the same series see 155b.

- Department of British and Mediaeval antiquities, 118.
 Department of Coins, *ib.*
 Department of Greek and Roman antiquities, *ib.*
 Department of Oriental antiquities, 119.
 early Classical MSS.—five Greek classical papyri and the Harley Glossary—38-40.
 inscriptions, 27.
 Lygdamis inscription, 314.
 marbles, 117.
 Naukratis collection, 26.
 painted vase (Vase Cat. No. 996), 3.
 Poli-tis-Chrysokhou finds, 25, 26, 316.
 terra-cottas, 117.
 vases, 27, 118.
 vases from Kalymnos, 80.
 Brugmann and Osthoff's *Morphologische Untersuchungen*, 265*a*.
 Brugmann on the *Nasalis sonans*, 264*b*.
 Brugmann's *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der Indogermanischen Sprachen*, 62 foll.
 Bruns' *Fontes iuris Romani antiqui*, 157-8.
 Bryans' Caesar, *Bell. Gall.*, iv., 233-4.
 Bryennius, 302*b*.
 Buchanan, *Maiac Calendae*, 46*a*.
 Ruddiman's *Vindication of*, *ib.*
 Bücheler's reprint of Otto Jahn's *Persius, Juvenal and Sulpicia*, 17 foll.
 Budge's (E. A. W.) Catalogue of Egyptian antiquities in Harrow School Museum, 285-6.
 Burney's critique on Milton's Greek verses, 46*b*.
 Bury's (J. B.) note on Aesch. *Agam.* (1227*ff.*); *ib.* (1310), 241.
 note on Eur. *Or.* 399, *ib.*
 notice of Bethe's *Quaestiones Diodorae Mythographicae*, 273.
 notice of Schwartz' *Scholia in Euripidem*, 272-3.
 notice of Vahlen's *Longinos*, 300 foll.
 -bus, -bi, bis, the case-terminations, 120*b*.
 Butcher's (S. H.) notice of Weil's *Demosthenes*, 218 foll.
 Caesar, *Bell. Gall.*, Bond and Walpole's, 233.
 Bell. Gall. iv., Bryans', 233-4.
 Bell. Gall. v., Colbeck's, 72.
 facsimile of MSS., 231*a*.
 Lexicons to, by Merguet, Meusel, Menge-Preuss and (for Pseudo-Caesar) Preuss, 111.
 [See also under 'Latin Writers.']
 Caesar's Bridge over the Rhine (*B. G.*, iv. 17), 168-9, 242.
 Speech in behalf of the Catilinarians (*Sall. Cat.* 51), 169.
 Cagnat's *Cours élémentaire d' épigraphie latine*, 162.
 Callistratus and Philonides, Briel's, 273.
 Calpurnius and Nemesianus, Keene's, 276.
 Cambridge Philological Society, 23-4.
 communications to the, 24*b*.
 Whitelaw's papers before the, 133*b*.
 Cambridge University Intelligence, 23, 77, 90, 171, 184, 209, 215, 285, 314, 324.
 Camillus (Κάδμος), 120*b*.
 Campbell and Abbott's Sophocles for Schools, 2 vols., 132-3.
 Cannae, positions of the enemy at, 109*b*.
 Cannegieter's Avianus, 188-9.
 'Carchemish, mina of,' 172*b*.
 carmen, etymology of, 86*b*.
 Carmen Saeculare Graece redditum, 114.
 Carmina figurata Graeca, Haeberlin's, 304.
 Carnarvon's (Earl of) Odyssey of Homer, i.—xii., 159-60.
 χάρτης, 196*a*.
 Carthage, Church's, 204.
 Cassius Longinus, the teacher of Zenobia, 300*a*.
 Cato's *Origines* possibly suggested by the Κτίσεις of Apollonius Rhodius, 7*a*.
 Catullus, facsimile of MSS., 231*a*.
 iii., translation of by G. S. Davies, 205*b*.
 [See also under 'Latin Writers.']
 Cauer's *Homeri Odyssea*, 198.
 Causeret's *Étude sur la langue de la rhétorique et de la critique littéraire dans Cicéron*, 222 foll.
 Cavaliers Athéniens, Martin's, 228 foll.
 cavillor, meaning and etymology of, 244; cp. 121*b*.
 cella, 259*a*.
 ceraria (toraria), Plaut. *Mil. Glor.* (695), 79*b*.
 χελιδόνισμα at Smyrna, the, 238*a*.
 Chaeroneia, the memorial lion of, 317*a*.
 Chaignet's *Essais de Métrique grecque*, 303.
 Chase's Chrysostom, 236.
 Chatelain's *Paléographie des Classiques Latins*, 230-1.
 χαυρόμενον, 91*b*.
 Chronicle of Guillaume de Nangis, MS. of, 147*b*.
 Church of the Early Fathers, Plummer's, 237*a*.
 Church's Carthage, 204.
 Chrysostom, a Study in the History of Biblical Interpretation, Chase's, 236.
 De Sacerdotio libri sex, Seltmann's, 303.
 Cicero, *De Oratore Liber Primus*, Stobile's, 306.
 dell' Oratore Libri tre, Cima's, *ib.*
 De Senectute, Huxley's, 111.
 De Suppliciis...De Signis, Thomas', 72.
 facsimile of MSS., 231*a*.
 Hadoardus MS. of, Schwenke's, 110.
 Müller's (C. F. W.), 136 foll.
 Oratio Philippica Secunda, Peskett's, 72.
 Schiebe's and Nohl's, 135-6.
 [See also under 'Latin Writers.']
 Cicéron *Jurisconsulte*, Gasquy's, 73.
 Cicero's Correspondence, points of Roman Law in Prof. Tyrrell's edition of, 66 foll.
 Rhetorical Criticism, Causeret's, 222 foll.
 style contrasted with that of Demosthenes, 301*a*.
 Cima's *M. Tullii Cicerone dell' Oratore Libri tre* 306.
 circumscriptus, 224*b*.
 Clark's (W. G.) *Peloponnesus*, 20.
 Classical Antiquity, Monuments of, Baumeister's, 202-3.
 Coincidences, Gretton's, 74.
 Education in France, letters from a French University Professor, 206, 245, 282.
 Education, Sidgwick (A.), on the Future of, 215*a*.
 MSS. in the British Museum, early, 38 foll.
 MSS., Scheme for a Catalogue of Greek and Latin, 217-8.
 Clavis Novi Testamenti, Grimm's Wilke's, re-edited by Prof. Thayer, 106 foll.
 Clement, John, 244-5.
 Cluer's Livy, v. vi. vii., revised by P. E. Matheson, 112.
 Codex Amiatinus, 84*a*.
 Bembinus, 231*a*.
 Palatinus, Tischendorf on, 281.
 Purpureus, 269*b*.
 Puteanus, 146*a*.
 Rossanensis, 269*a*.
 Thuanus, 231*a*.
 [See also under 'MSS.']
 Coins in British Museum, Catalogue of Greek, 248.
 Department of, 118.
 Coins of Palestine in the Albert Hall, 117.
 Colbeck's Caesar, *Bell. Gall.* v., 72.
 Colby's (F. T.) notes on Eur. *Ion.* (998, 1027), 115*b*.
 Coleridge's (H. N.) *Introduction to the Study of the Greek Poets*, 12*a*.

- Collier's (Jeremy) translation of Marcus Aurelius, revised by A. Zimmern, 232.
- Collins (J. C.) on Greek and Latin Classics v. English Literature, 83.
- Colossus of Rhodes, the, 299*b*.
- coluber*, 121*b*.
- Commentary, the Pulpit: Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians, 71.
- Comparetti (Prof.), 85.
- Composition, Greek and Latin:—
Carmen Saeculare Graece redditum, E. D. Stone, 114.
 Cupressi, C. A. Ulrichs, 161.
 Dedication (from 'Echoes of Hellas'), G. C. Warr, 309.
 Experiments in Archaic Metre, G. C. Warr, 168.
 ἡ μελάνοσσος Σούσαννα, Sir G. Denman, 76.
 Στέφανος. Carmina sua Graeca et Latina, T. Korsch, 161.
- Conditional Sentences in Latin E. A. Sonnenschein, 124, 238.
 H. J. Roby, 197, 238.
 J. B. M., 239.
- conglutinatio verborum*, 224*b*.
- coniecturae* Babrianae, 193*a*.
- Conjugation, Latin, Engelhardt's, 147 foll.
- Cookes (A. H.) notice of Jevons' *Development of the Athenian Democracy*, 58 foll.
- Cope's *Introduction to the Rhetoric*, 98, 99, 100, 223.
- Corbie, the Abbey of, 146*b*.
- Corbey MS. of St. James, 268*a*.
- Corinthians, First Epistle to the, Lias', 235.
- Corippus, Petschenig's, 158.
- Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, the Vienna:—
 I. *Eugippii Excerpta ex Operibus S. Augustini*, Knoell's, 139 foll.
 II. *Eugippii Vita* S. Severini, Knoell's, 224 foll.
- Correspondence, 83, 171, 205, 245, 282.
- Course of Modern Greek*, Zompoides', 113.
- Cremer's *Lexicon of New Testament Greek*, 106 foll.
- Crusius' *Plutarchi de Proverbiis Alexandrinorum*, 272.
- 'Crystallization Theory' of Homeric poems, 12*b*.
- Cutae of Vergil, Hildebrandt's, 274 foll.
- Curetonian MS., 269*a*.
- Curtius (Georg), *Ein Charakteristik*, Windisch's, 263 foll.
Das Verbum der griechischen Sprachen, 264.
Grenzüge, 264-5.
Zur Chronologie, 264.
Kritik der neuesten Sprachforschung, 265.
- Curtius-Stiftung*, the foundation of the, 264.
- Cynaethus of Chios and his School (Schol. on Pindar, *Nem.* ii. 1), 37*b*.
- completion of the *Iliad* ascribed to (cp. *Il.* ii. 594-600), 38*a*.
- the probable reviser of the *Odyssey*, 37*b*.
- 'Cyclic' poems, 269*a*.
- Cyprian inscriptions, Homeric words found in, 91*b*, 92*a*.
- Cyprus, 25, 26, 80, 286, 317.
- Cyzicus, electrum staters of, 172*a*.
- Daremborg and Saglio's *Dictionnaire des Antiquités grecques et romaines*, 201.
- Darmesteter's *La Vie des Mots*, 161.
- Davies' (G. S.) translation of 'Lesbia's Sparrow,' Catull. iii., 205*b*.
 (J. F.) editions of the *Agamemnon*, *Choephores*, and *Eumenides*, 247-8.
- Dawes' *Miscellanea Critica*, misstatement in, 47*b*.
 (M. C.) notice of Zompoides' *Course of Modern Greek*, 113.
- 'Day-Book of John Dorne, Bookseller,' (1520) 84*b*.
- De Artium Scriptoribus Latinis*, Boelte's, 278-9.
- De la latinité des sermons de Saint Augustin*, Regnier's, 235-6.
- De Sacerdotio libri sex*, Chrysostom's, Selmann's, 303.
- De Saussure on Phonetic Variation, 64, 148*b*.
- δέατοι (cp. Homeric δέατο), 92*a*.
- Declaration of the French Clergy in 1682, facsimile of the, 146*a*.
- Dedication (from 'Echoes of Hellas') G. C. Warr, 309.
- deicere*, restricted meaning of, 67*a*.
- δείδω, 197*b*.
- Delphi, excavations at, 82.
- Delisle (Léopold), 141*a*, 145*a*, 146*b*.
- Demetrius Phalereus' *περί ἐρμηνείας*, the authenticity of, 222*b*.
- deminuere*, technical use of, 69*b*.
- Demosthenes, *Androt.* 44, note on, 77-8.
 bas-relief on the altar at Calauria representing, 313*b*.
 Parisian MS. (S.) 218.
Select Orations, Wotke's, 271.
Select Private Orations, Paley and Sandys', (ed. 2), 14-15.
 Shilleto's edition of the *De Falsa Legatione*, 14*a*.
Speeches against Aristogeiton, authenticity of, 221; cp. p. 308*b*.
 Wayte's editions of the *Androtion* and *Timocrates*, 28*a*.
 Weil's, 218 foll.
 contrasted with Cicero, 301*a*.
 [See also under 'Greek writers.']
- Denkmäler des Klassischen Altertums*, Baumeister's, 202-3.
- Denman's (Sir G.) 'Black-eyed Susan,' Greek Iambics, 76.
- deprecatio* (παράτησις), 223*b*.
- Derivation of *titulus*, the, 78-9.
- Description of Greece, Pausanias', translation by A. R. Shilleto, 101.
- desirium* (desiderium), *desiro*, *desire*, 180*b*.
- Desjardins, E. (30 Sept. 1823—22 Oct. 1886), 24.
- Development of the Athenian Democracy, Jevons', 58 foll.
- Diadochi, the period of, 7, 44, 203.
- Dialect der homerischen Gedichte*, van Leeuwen, jun. and Mendes da Costa's, translated by Dr. E. Mehler, 199.
- Dialects spoken in Palestine in the time of Christ, 194.
- dicendi genus tenue, grave, and medium*, 222*b*.
- Dictionnaire des Antiquités grecques et romaines*, Ch. Daremborg et Edm. Saglio, 210.
- Diels' (H.) *Herodot und Hekataios*, 320*a*.
Seneca und Lucan, 294*b*.
- Dikaios ('avis cognomine Justa,' Zoega), 244*b*.
- δικαιον, on the meaning of, *ib*.
- δίκη ἐπιτροπῆς, 165*a*.
- 'Diminutives falsely so called,' Weinhold on, 228*a*.
- Diodorus, on the mythology of, Bethe, 273.
- Dionysiac theatre, excavations in the, 297-8.
- Dionysios or Longinos on *Sublimity of Style*, 300 foll.
- Discussions on the Gospels*, Dr. Roberts', 197*b*.
- δοκιμασία, 229*b*.
- Doctrina duodecim Apostolorum &c.*, Funk's, 302.
- Dodwell's *Classical and Topographical Tour through Greece*, 20*a*.
- D' Ooge (Professor) on the excavations in the Dionysiac theatre, 298*b*.

- Doriadas, the *βωμός* of, 304*a*.
 Dosson's *Étude sur Quinte Curce, sa vie et son oeuvre*, 307.
 Dramatists, Greek, Schmidt's Studies on the, 93 foll.
Droit public Romain, Girard's, 165-6.
 Dublin University Intelligence, 115, 171, 247.
 Duff's (J. D.) notice of Pearson and Strong's *Juvenal*, 154-5.
 Dutch Biographical Dictionary, Van der Aa's, 189*a*.
δυσμένην, 36*a*.
 Duvau's reprint of Havet's *Greek and Latin Metre*, 162.
 -*ε*, Latin ablatives in, 120*b*.
 E-stems, the long vowel of, 199*a*.
ηα for *εια* (e.g. *εὐσέβηα*) in Inscriptions, 188*a*.
 Early Classical MSS. in the British Museum, 38 foll.
 'Early Egyptian Revival,' 250*a*.
 Ecclesiastical Canons, 302*b*.
 'Echoes of Hellas,' Dedication from, G. C. Warr, 309.
 Eckhel's *Doctrina Numorum*, 172.
 Editorial, 1.
 Edon's *Écriture et Prononciation du Latin Savant et du Latin Populaire, et Appendice sur le Chant dit les Frères Arvales*, 163.
Éléments de Grammaire latine (d'après Lhomond), 200.
Nouvelle Étude sur le Chant Lémural, 163.
Restitution et Nouvelle Interprétation du Chant dit des Frères Arvales, 163.
 Education in France, Classical: letters from a French University Professor, 205, 245, 282.
 Edwards' (G. M.) notice of Welldon's *Rhetoric of Aristotle*, 98 foll.
ἐγβάλλειν, *ἐγλογῆς*, 188*a*.
ἐγγειος τόκος, 165*a*.
ἐείκοσι, *ἔεδνα*, *ἐέλωρ*, 36*a*.
 Egypt Exploration Fund, 317*a*.
 Miscellanea from, 209.
 Egyptian decimal system, 172*a*.
ει for *ι* and *vice versa* in Inscriptions, 188*a*.
εἶδαν, 187*b*.
ειresioné, the, 152*a*.
εἰσαγγελία κακώσεως, 165.
ἐδικος of a city, the official (cp. Cic. *ad Fam.* xiii. 56), 44*b*.
ἐκκυκλεῖν, *ἐκκύκλημα*, 298*b*.
 Ellis' (Robinson) *Fables of Avianus*, reviewed by John E. B. Mayor, 188 foll.
 notice of Bücheler's Otto Jahn's *Persius, Juvenal and Sulpicia*, 17 foll.
 notice of Hildebrandt's Virgil's *Culex*, 274 foll.
 notice of Sonntag's *Appendix Vergiliana*, 306-7.
Éloquence judiciaire à Rome pendant la République, Poiret's, 273-4.
ἐμφέρειν, 36*a*.
enclisis ('recession'), 104*a*.
ἐνγειον (= *ἐγγιον*), *ἐνκατέλιπεν*, 188*a*.
 Engelhardt's *Die Lateinische Konjugation*, 147 foll.
 English Literature v. Greek and Latin Classics in the Universities, 8 foll., 83.
enthymeme, 99-100.
ἦδα pro ἦω: *ἦος pro ἔως*, 198*b*.
 Ep. Barnab., 302*b*.
ἐπασσύτερος, 35*b*.
 Epic metre, theory of the origin of, 92*a*.
ἐπισημασία, meanings of in Cicero, 79*b*.
ἐπισμυγρός, 36*a*.
epistola, orthography of, 74*b*.
Epithalamia of Sappho, 92*b*.
ἐπίτροπος, *κύριος*—*testamentarii, legitimi, dativi*, 165.
ἐπωβελία, 151*a*.
 Epochs of Church History. 'The Church of the Early Fathers, Plummer's, 237.
ἐρεβεννός, 35*b*.
Ergasilus, 304*a*.
cro = Gr. *ω*, 148*b*.
ἔρος, 36*b*.
 'Erotic discourses of Socrates,' Thompson on the, 35*a*.
ἔσκετο—not *ἔσχετο*—Od. iv. (705), 322*b*.
ἐσκυκλεῖν, 298*a*.
Essais de Métrique grecque, Chaignet's, 303.
-εσσι, Epic dative plural in, 37*a*., 91*a*.
Étude sur la langue de la rhétorique et de la critique littéraire dans Cicéron, Causeret's, 222 foll.
Étude sur Quinte Curce, sa vie et son oeuvre, Dosson's, 307.
Études Classiques avant la Révolution, Sicard's, 167.
εὐαθε, 35*b*., 199*b*.
Eudoxi ars astronomica, F. Blass (ed. 2), 272.
 Eugippius' *Excerpta ex operibus S. Augustini*, Knoell's, 139 foll.
Vita S. Severini, Knoell's, 224 foll.
εὐκηλος, 36*b*.
εὐληρα, *ib*.
 Euripides, *I. T.* (15, 35), 240-1.
Ion (978, 1027), 115.
Medea (1052), Badham's reading, 134*a*.
Medea, edd. of, by Barthold, Glazebrook and Heberden, 132 foll.
Or. (399), 241.
Phaethon, (coll. *Or.* 982 ff.). 150*b*.
 [See also under 'Greek Writers.']
εὐτραπεία, 108*a*.
εὐχωλᾶς, 91*b*.
Evangelium Palatinum, Tischendorf's, 281.
 Evans' (A. J.) notice of Head's *Historia Numorum*, 171 foll.
 Excavations at Assarlik, 81-2.
 Cyprus, 25, 26, 317.
 Delphi, 82.
 Iasos, 176, 317.
 Majorca, 317.
 Mantinea, *ib*.
 Minorea, *ib*.
 Nisyros, 82.
 Orvieto, 117.
 Sidon, 117, 318.
 Smyrna, 82.
 Tiryns, 317.
 Trieste, *ib*.
 Volo, 80.
 difficulties in the way of, 25.
 in the Dionysiac theatre, 297-8.
 Experiments in Archaic Metre, G. C. Warr, 168.
extenuare, extenuatio, 223.
Extracts for Translation, selected by R. C. Jebb, H. Jackson and W. E. Currey, 309.
Fables of Avianus, Cannegieter's, 188.
 Robinson Ellis', *ib*.
 Facsimiles of MSS. of Latin Classics, 230-1.
facundus (*facundia*) of literary eloquence, 16*b*.
 Farrar's *Greek Grammar Rules*, (§ 93), 128*b*.
 shades of meaning in Conditional Sentences 125*b*.
 Faults in Milton's Latin Poetry, 46 foll.
 Fayûm, the papyri from, 186.
Festi Breviarium, Wagener's, 158.
 Festus, Reitzenstein on, 307-8.
 Fick, Three books on Homer, 35 foll. 91 foll.
 Field's, (Dr.) *Otium Norvicense*, 4*a*., 107*a*.
Fontes iuris Romani antiqui, Bruns', 157-8.
foris esse, 69*b*.
 Forsyth's *Hortensius*, 273*b*.
 Fowler's (W. W.) notice of Church's *Carthage*, 204.
 notice of Girard's *Droit public Romain*, 165-6.

Fowler's (W. W.) notice of Holden's *Plutarchi Sulla*, 152-3.

notice of Mahaffy's *Alexander's Empire*, 203-4.

Fragmata Herculanensia, Scott's, 185 foll.

Poetarum Latinorum, Baehrens', 74.

Fragments of Aristotle, 205.

France, Classical education in: letters from a French University Professor, 205, 245, 282.

Fränkel's reprint of Boeckh's *Die Staatshaushaltung der Athener*, 149 foll.

Freeman's *Lectures on Comparative Politics*, 58b.

Lectures on Historical Study, 112.

Friedländer's *Martial*, 56 foll.

Frogs, Greek, note on, 20.

Funk's *Doctrina duodecim Apostolorum*, 302.

Furni, archaeological researches at, 82b.

Furneaux' (H.) notice of Knoke's *Kriegzüge des Germanicus in Deutschland*, 277-8.

Person's *Tacitus*, 154.

g in *ne g*-otium, *ne g*-legens, *ne g*-o, 120b.

Gardner's *Peloponnesus*, 248-9.

Garrucci's *Le monete dell' Italia Antica*, 173a.

Gasquy's *Cicéron Jurisconsulte*, 73.

Geare's Notes on Thucydides, Book I., 231.

γέλος, 36b.

General Karte des Königreiches Griechenland, 279.

Gentleman's Magazine Library, the: Romano-British Remains, Part I. Gomme's, 298 foll.

Gerousia, functions of the, 44a.

Gertz' *L. Annaei Senecae dialogorum libri vii.* 19.

Geschichte der griechischen Literatur, Bender's, 19.
der Römischen Kaiserzeit (Band II.), Schiller's, 266 foll.

Gilbert's *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton Libri*, 74.

Giles' (P.), note on Liv. xlii. 17, coll. Appian, *Maced.* xi. (7, 8), 170.

Girard's translation of Mommsen's *Staatsrecht*, 165-6.

Glazebrook's (M.G.) Euripides, *Medea*, reviewed by A. W. Verrall, 132 foll.

notice of Austrian Staff Maps of Greece, 279

notice of Neumann and Partsch's *Physikalische Geographie von Griechenland*, 203.

notice of Oberhummer's *Akarnania, Ambrakia, &c.*, 279.

Glossary, Greek and Latin, Laon MS., 147a.
the Harley, 40.

γλυφίδες, on the meaning of, 244.

Godley's Tacitus, *Histories*, i. ii., 154.

Gomme's *Romano-British Remains* (The Gentleman's Magazine Library), 298 foll.

Gomperz (Prof.), 185, 188.

Goodwin's treatment of Conditional Sentences, 125.

Gorgias and Phaedrus, of Thompson's editions of the, 34b.

Goulain's (Jean) *Information des Princes*, MS. of, 147b.

Græco-Roman Population, Beloch's, 164.

Grammaticæ Latine, Reinach's, 200

éléments de (d'après Lhomond), Edon's, *ib.*

γραφαι τιμηταί, 165b.

γραφὴ κακώσεως, *ib.*

Graves' (C. E.) notice of Geare's *Notes on Thucydides* I., 231.

gravitas of Roman eloquence, 274a.

Greece, Austrian Staff Maps of, 279.

Geography of, Neumann and Partsch's, 283

Travels in, by Mahaffy, Krumbacher, and Sandys, 237-8.

Greek Accentuation, Wheeler's, 103 foll.

and Latin Classics & English Literature, 8 foll., 93.

and Latin Metre, Havet's, edited by Duvau, 162.

Composition:

Carmen Saeculare Graece redditum, 114.

Dedication (from the "Echoes of Hellas"), 309.

Greek Composition (*continued*)—

ἡ μελάνοσσος Σούσαννα, 76.

Experiments in Archaic Metre, 68.

Στέφανος, Theodore Korsch, 161.

Course of Modern, Zompolides', 112.

Dramatists, Studies on the, Schmidt's, 93 foll.

Frogs, note on, 20.

Literature, Bender's, 19

Lyric Poets, Pomtow's, 152.

Metre, Essays on, Chaignet's, 303.

early, Usener's, 162-3.

Plays, some school editions of—Sophocles, by Campbell and Abbott; Euripides, *Medea*, by Barthold, Glazebrook and Heberden—132 foll.

Prose, Lectures on, A. Sidgwick's, 73-4.

Sculpture, Introduction to, Upcott's, 72; cp. p. 26.

Testament, Lexicons to the, 106 foll.

on some political terms in the, 4 foll., 42 foll.

references to the:—

S. Matthew (viii. 5—xvii. 13, forming the second book of Macarius Chrysocephalus' *Cutena* on

S. Matthew), 281b.; (viii. 15), 269a.; (xi. 29f.)

302b.; (xvii. 21; xix. 17; xxiv. 36), 268b.;

(xxiv. 15f.), 319b.; (xxvi. 29), 302b.; (xxvii.

35), 268b.; (xxvii. 46), 195b.; (xxviii. 18), 268b.

S. Mark, (v. 41; vii. 34), 195b.; (vi. 11; ix. 44, 46; xv. 28; xvi. *ad fin.*), 268b.; (vii. 11), 196a.; (ix. 34), 45b.; (xii. 19, ἀφίημι), 24b.; (xiii. 14 coll. *Matt.* xxiv. 15f., *Luke* xxi. 20f.), 319b.; (xv. 34), 195b.; (xv. 43), 43b.

S. Luke (i. 15), 196a.; (ii. 1), 45a.; (vii. 49, ἀφίημι), 24b.; (xiv. 32), 44b.; (xxi. 20f.), 319b.; (xxiii. 50), 43b.; (xxiv. 9, 11), 281a.

S. John (viii. 37), 108b.; (xiv. 27, ἀφίημι), 24b.; xv. 1), 302b.

Acts (i. 16-21), 179a.; (ii. 6, 7), 195a.; (ii. 10),

6a.; (ii. 14), 195a.; (ii. 24), 43b.; (iv. 13),

44b.; (v. 12; xii. 20), 45b.; (v. 21), 44a.;

(ix. 4, 7; xxii. 7, 9), 108a.; (x. 22), 43a.;

(xii. 21f.), 42a.; (xiv. 11), 195b.; (xv. 10),

302b.; (xvi. 4), 45a.; (xvi. 12), 196a.; (xvi.

21), 6b.; (xvii. 5), 42a.; (xvii. 7), 45a.;

(xvii. 21), 6a.; (xix. 30, 33, 39, 40, 41), 42a.;

(xix. 31, Ἀσιάρχαι), 4a. n.; (xix. 35, ὁ γραμματεὺς τοῦ δήμου), 4a. n.; (xxi. 40), 195a. b.;

(xxiii. 30), 45a.; (xxiv. 2, 10, 17), 43a.;

(xxvi. 4), 43a.; (xxviii. 19), 43a.

Romans (iii. 13-18), 182a.; (v. 1-11), 182a.; (xv.

20), 46b.; (xvi. 2), 6b.; (xvi. 23, ὁ οἰκονόμος

τῆς πόλεως), 4a. n.; (xvi. 25), 107a.; J. H. A.

Michelsen on, 181b., 182a.

1 *Corinthians* (i. 13), 235a.; (vii. 21), 235a.;

(vii. 34), 235b.; (x. 29), 235b.; (xi. 1-16),

181b.; (xiii. 2; xiv. 2), 107b.; (xiii. 4), 268a.;

(xiv. 16, 23f.), 44b.; (xvi. 22), 196b.; Canon

Evans' treatment of *ἵνα* as exemplified in, 235a.

2 *Corinthians* (ii. 14), 108b.; (iii. 18), 108b.; (v.

20), 44b.; (xi. 6), 44b.; (xi. 32), 7b.; Heinrici's

Commentary on, 291b.

Galatians (ii. 5; iii. 5-10; 15-25; with refer-

ence to Marcion's text), 291b.; (iii. 19), 235b.;

(iii. 23), 8a. b.

Ephesians (i. 9), 108a.; (ii. 12 ff.) 5b.; (ii. 15),

15a.; (iv. 11), 71b.; (v. 32), 107b.; (vi. 18),

4b.; (vi. 19), 108a.; (vi. 20), 44b.; Professor

Godet on, 179a.

Philippians (i. i), 71b.; (i. 27), 6b.; (ii. 6), 30b.

71b.; (iii. 20), 7a.; (iv. 7), 8b.

Colossians (ii. 14, 20), 45a.

2 *Thessalonians* (ii. 1), 43b.

1 *Timothy* (i. 15) 4a.

Philemon (9), 106b.

Hebrews (x. 25), 43b.; xi. (μαρτυρεῖσθαι *passim*),

46a.; (xi. 9, 13, 16), 5b.

Greek Testament, references to the (*continued*)—

- James* (i. 1), 45*a.*; (i. 6), 109*b.*; (ii. 2), 43*b.*; (ii. 7), 268*a.*; (iii. 9*ff.*), 189*b.*; (v. 2), 268*a.*
1 Peter (i. 1, 17), 5*b.*; (i. 5), 8*a.*; (ii. 11*f.*), 5*b.*; (iv. 19), 7*a.*
1 John (ii. 12-14), 70*a.*; (v. 6-8), 70*a.*
Revelation (vii. 9-17; xi. 1-13; xiv. 14-20; xvii.), 212*b.*
 Scrivener's (third edition), 70.
 Weymouth's Resultant, *ib.*
 Theatre, Albert Müller's, 296 foll.
 Vases, Klein's, 176.
 Writers referred to:—
Aelian De Nat. Anim. iv. (41), 244*b.*; v. h. x. (17), 28*a.*
Aeneas Tact. (31 coll. Hdt. viii. 128), 244*a.*
Aeschines, De Fals. Leg. (175), 149*a.*
Aeschylus Agam. (198 *ff.* = 188 *ff.* Dindorf), 240*b.*; (202 *ff.* = 192 *ff.* D.), 240*a.*; (301), 204*a.*; (334 = 344 D.), 55*a.*; (418), 95*a.*; (805-9; 832-50), 313*a.*; (1071), 94*a.*; (1072—1177; 1087 coll. 1186; 1093 coll. 1185; 1095 *ff.* coll. 1217 *ff.*; 1109 coll. 1229; 1115-17), 241*b.*; (1143 = 1172 D.), 24*b.*; (1178; 1227-30), 241*b.*; (1229), 241*b.* n.; (1310, 1382, 1611), 241*b.*
Cho. (273, 516), 288*b.*; (845 *f.*), 95*a.*; (927), 53*a.*
Eum. (76), 289*b.*; (585, Schol. on), 298*a.*; (631*f.*), 313*a.*; (696), 54*b.* n.
Pers. (163*f.*, 426*f.*, 468, 739, 751, 754, 755, 782, 966), 130*a.* b.; (677 *ff.*), 313*b.*
Pr. V. (1031), 94*b.*; (1077 *ff.*), 241*b.*
Suppl. (456), 288*b.*
Theb. (13), 50*b.*; (23, 100 = 103 D.), 51*a.*; (118, 132 = 125, 146 D.), 50*a.*; ((124, 211 = 225 D.), 51*a.*; (218 = 232 D.), 51*b.*; (233 = 247 D.), 53*a.*; (244), 95*a.*; (251 = 265 D.), 51*a.* b.; (254 = 268 D.), 52*a.*; (259 = 273 D.; 263 = 277 D.), 53*a.*; (269 = 282 D.), 51*a.* b.; (311 = 324 D.), 53*a.*; (322 = 355 D.; 332-355 = D.), 51*a.*; 415*f.* = 428*f.* D.), 52*b.*; (531 = 544 D.), 51*a.* b.; (549 = 562 D.), 52*b.*; 577 *f.* = D.), 53*a.*; 600 *f.* = 613 *f.* D.), 51*a.* b.; (611 = 624 D.) 51*a.*; (628 = 641 D.), 52*a.*; (648 = 661 D.), 51*a.* b.; (670 *ff.* = 683 *ff.* D.; 696 = 709 D.), 51*a.*; (729 = 743 D.; 766 = 781 D.), 50*b.*; (769 *ff.* = 784 *ff.* D.), 52*a.*; (771), 131*a.*; (773 = 788 D.), 50*b.*; (828 = 842 D.; 998 = 1007 D.), 51*a.*; (1002 = 1011 D.), 52*a.*; (1008 = 1017 D.), 51*a.*; (1013 = 1022 D.), 52*a.*; (1038 = 1047 D.), 51*a.*
Andocides, De Pace (8) 149*a.*
Aphthonius ii. (8, Schol. on), 223*b.*; iv. (210, 7; 211, 22), *ib.*; *progymn.* (1), 189*b.*
Apollonius Rhodius iii. (117 *ff.*), 170*b.*; (218), 244*b.*; (282), 244*a.*
Appian Maced. xi. (7, 8), 170*a.*
Aristophanes Achar. (36), 3*b.* 115*a.*; (100), 204*a.*; (408), 298*b.*; (625, Schol. on), 3*b.*; (654) 273*b.*; (1096) 29*b.*
Av. (454), 131*b.*; (1530), 129*a.*
Eccl. (650), 97*b.*; (818 *ff.*), 151*a.*
Eq. (258 *ff.*), 280*a.*; (895), 255*b.*; (1014), 78*a.*
Lysistr. (42, 71, 83), 97*a.*; (95), 98*a.*; (143, 183, 191, 271, 287, 297), 97*a.*; (553), 97*b.*; (581), 98*a.*; (633, 634, 654, 662), 97*a.*; (726 coll. Wakefield on Eur. *Ion*, 1430 = 1410 D.; Hdt. vi. 86), 97*b.*; (763 *f.*), 97*a.*; (1256), 98*a.*; (1267), 97*a.*; (1313), 98*a.*
Nub. (37, Schol. on), 229*a.*; (280 *ff.*), 131*b.*; (1065 coll. Lys. xix. 45; Ael. v. h. x. 17), 28*a.*; (1414 *f.*), 131-2.
Pax (129 *f.*; 741 *ff.*), 131*a.*; (989 *f.*; 1183 *f.*), 131*b.*
Plut. (3 *ff.*, Schol. on; 9, Schol. on), 242*a.*; (39, Schol. on), 78*a.*; (66, Schol. on; 74,

Greek Writers referred to (*continued*)—

- Plut. Schol. on*), 242*a.*; (78, Schol. on), 242*b.*; (84, Schol. on), 78*b.*; (137, Schol. on; 139, Schol. on; 151, Schol. on; 155, Schol. on), 242*b.*; (488), 219*a.*
Ran. (86 *ff.*) 128-9; (209), 20*a.* b.; (295), 109*b.*; (308, 346 *ff.*) 129*a.*; (549 *ff.* = 605 *ff.*), 131*a.*; (572 *f.*), 129*a.*; (761 *ff.*), 129*b.*; (819), 129-30; (948), 130*a.*; (1028 *f.*), 130*a.*; 289*b.*; 313*a.*; (1124, 1298 *f.*), 130*b.*
Th. (265), 298*b.*
Vesp. (105, 291, 318), 97*a.*; (355), 204*b.*; (394), 98*a.*; (536, 540, 577), 97*a.*; (588), 97*b.*; (599, 640), 97*a.*; (651), 97*b.*; (676), 97*a.*; (694), 3*b.* n.; (718, Schol. on), 151*a.*; (748), 97*a.*; (794 *ff.*, illustrated by Hahn, ii. 85), 258*a.*; (849, 873, 906, 999, 1020, 1110, 1230), 97*a.*; (1286), 97*a.*; 273*b.*; (1291), 97*a.*; (1525), 97*b.*; (1528), 97*a.*
Aristotle, Anal. Pr. II. (27), 100*a.*
Eth. Nic. II. (vii. 13), 108*a.*; IV. (viii. 4), *ib.*
Gen. Anim. IV. (vi. 14), 100*b.*
Poet. xviii. (1455*b.* 32 *ff.*), 86*b.*; xxiv. (1459*b.* 8 *ff.*), *ib.*
Polit. II. (8), 60*a.*; (12), 59*a.* III. (v. 8, 1278*a.* 34), 21*a.*; (vi. 3, 1278*b.* 22), *ib.* VI. [IV.] (4-6), 59*a.*
Probl. xxxv. (3), 115*a.* b.
Rhet. I. (i. 11), 100*a.* b.; (ii. 8, 9), 99*a.* b.; (ii. 13), 100*a.*; (ii. 18; v. 3, 4 [coll. *gen. anim.* IV. vi. 14]; vii. 16), 100*b.* II. (vii. 4), 100*b.*; (xii. 16), 108*a.*; (xxi. 6), 100*a.*; (xxvi. 14), 100*b.* III. (v. 4, and Cope on), 170*b.*
Arrian Anab. III. (xvi. 8), 150*b.*
Indica (40), 42*b.*
Artemidorus Oneirocr. I. (78), 304*a.*
Athenaeus II. (p. 63 D. *ff.*), 57*b.*; IV. (p. 174), 29*a.*
Callimachus Hymn. Del. (10), 29*b.*
Demetrius περί ῥητορίας, III. (300, Spengel), 224*a.*
Demosthenes, Androt. (3), 218*b.*; (32), 220*a.*; (44), 77-8; 150*a.*; (77, coll. *Timocr.* 169), 78*a.*
Aphob. I. (5), 165*b.*; (7, 9), 320*a.*; (9, 37), 78*a.*; (67), 151*a.*
Aristocr. (33, 117), 219*a.*; (96), 220*a.*; (165), 218*b.*
Bocot. de Dot. (33, 42), 14*b.*
De Chers. (24), 271*a.*
De Cor. (89), 218*b.*; (107), 220*b.*
De Pace (10, 25), 271*a.*
De Symm. (19 coll. 27), 78*a.*; 150*a.*
Dionysod. (8, 32, 37), 14*b.*
Meid. (129), 220*a.*; (191), 224*a.*
Pantacr. (16), 14*b.*
[Phacnipp.] (24), 229*b.*
Phil. I. (36), 280*a.* II. (30), 271*a.* III. (70), 271*b.*
Phorm. (2), 220*a.*; (37), 15*a.*
Steph. I. (41), 220*b.*
Theocr. (6), 151*a.*
Timocr. (28), 220*a.*; (32), 14*b.*; (33, 36), 220*b.*; (39), 218*b.*; (42), 219*b.*; (43, 116), 220*a.*; (133, 149), 220*b.*; (169), 78*a.*; (195, 6), 218*b.*
Dinarchus I. (71), 165*b.*
Diodorus xix (45, 4 coll. *Aristoph. Vesp.* 355), 204*b.*
Diog. Laert. II. (10), 150*b.* III. (16), 192*b.* VII. (174), 151*a.*
Dionysios or Longinos περί ὑψους (c. viii.), 302*a.*; (cc. ix. x.), *ib.*; (c. xvii. coll. xv.), 301*b.*; (cxxxix.), 302*a.*
Epicharmus (*ap.* DL. iii. 16), 192*b.*
Eupolis (*ap.* Bekker's *Anecdota*, 401, 8), 305*a.*
Euripides Alc. (472 *ff.*), 54*b.*; (627), 96*b.*; (1153), 55*a.*
Andr. (462 *f.*), 95*a.* b.; (468, 746), 94*a.*
Bacch. (2), 303*b.*; (209), 95*b.*; (262), 130*a.*

Greek Writers referred to (*continued*)—Euripides, *Cycl.* (517), 51a.*El.* (1173), 55a.*fr.* (37), 94a.; (94), 95b.; (877), 54a. n.;*Phaethon* (*ap.* Diog. L. ii. 10), 150b.*H. F.* (1105), 53b.*Hec.* (1226 f.), 95b.*Hel.* (1609), 95a.*Her.* (169), 95a.; (529), 50b.*Hippol.* (11), 52a.; (441 f. coll. *Alc.* 627), 96b.*I. A.* (418, 671), 288b.*I. T.* (15, 35), 240-1; (867), 94a.*Ion.* (978 coll. 1188; 1027), 115b.: (1430 = 1410 D., Wakefield on), 97b.*Med.* (11), 135a.; (40 f.), 86a.; (109, 128), 255b.; (155, 182), 135b.; (217), 86a.; (228), 135b.; (330 f.), 54b.; (345), 255b.; (549), 55b.; (649), 288b.; (738 f.), 134b.; (822), 219a.; (823-844), 134b.; (838), 86a.; (890), 131b.; (942 f.), 135b.; (952), 51a.; (1051 f.), 134a.; (1081), 134b.; (1181), 55a.*Or.* (15, 147), 273a.; (215), 53b.; (274, Paley on), 244a.; (327, Schol. on), 273a.; (399), 241b.; (982 f., and Schol. on), 150b.*Phoen.* (1651 f.), 94a.*Suppl.* (94), 51a.; (745), 96b.*Tro.* (1051), 54b.Hekataios *Fr.* (229), 320a.; (284 coll. Hdt. ii. 156), *ib.*; (289-90 coll. Hdt. ii. 77), *ib.*Hephaestion *De Poem* (8), 92b.; 162b.Hermogenes *περὶ στίξεων* (II. 138, Spengel), 223b.

Herodotus I. (1), 156a.; (28 f., 43, 51, 72, 170), 156b. II. (34, 40, 51), 156b.; (77), 320a.; (102), 156a.; (156), 320a. III. (1), 150a.; (4), 27a.; (9, 14), 156b. IV. (54), 129b.; (79, 81, 124, 126, 153), 156b.; (195), 129b. V. (71), 229a. VI. (27), 129b.; (59-70), 157a.; (86), 97b.; (98, 105), 157a. VII. (2), 60b.; (195), 129b.; (213), 29a. VIII. (128, Abicht and Schweighäuser on), 244a. IX. (10), 86b.; (35), 248b.

Homer, *Hymn. Del. Apoll.* (14 f., 18, 117), 37b.*Hymn. Herm.* (152), 179b.; (224-5), 289a.; (234), 86a.; 288b.; (259, 427), 179b.*Iliad.* I. (6), 52b.; (246), 49b.; (609 f.), 163a. II. (318), 36b.; (594-600), 38a.; IV. (38), 94a.; (122, and Paley on), 244a.; V. (722), 49b.; VI. (119-236), 37b.; (168 f.), 93a. b.; VIII. (441), 49b.; X. (398), 49a.; XI. (29), 49b.; XII. (41), 28a.; XVII. (431), 280b.; XVIII. (570, Schol. on), 162b.; XX. (109), 280b.; XXI. (339), *ib.*; XXII. (126), 129b., XXIV. (451), 273a.

Margites, 86a.

Odys. I. (184), 37b.; V. (12 f.), *ib.*; VI. (161 f.), *ib.*; VII. (18, 105 f., 232, 249, 261, 286, 318 f.), 160a.; XI. (313), 36a.; XII. (313), *ib.*; (336, Schol. on), 109b.; XIII. (191), 270b.; XIX. (229), 288a.; XX. (383), 37b.; XXI. (419), 244a.; XXIV. (211, 338, 365 f.), 37b.Isocrates (x. 35), 320b.; *adv. Call.* (§§3, 15), 151a.Josephus *Ant.* XX. (i. 2), 43b.*Bell. Jud.* II. (xvii. 1), *ib.*; IV. (x. 1), 301b.; V. (v. 2), 5b. n.Julius Pollux III. (42), 165a.; VIII. (48), 151a.; (52), 165a.; (86), 235a.; (93, 101, 107), 165a.; (108), 229b.; 131, 59a.; *Onomasticon*, dedication of, 46b.

Libanius, 151a.

Lucian, *Demosth. Encom.* (32), 224b.*Dial. Deor.* (IV.), 170b.

Lysias V. (43), 230a.; VII. (37), 165a.; XII. (22), 95a.; XVI. (6), 230a.; XIX. (45), 28a.; XXIX. (13), 219a.

Greek Writers referred to (*continued*)—Marcus Aurelius I. (15, 16), 232b.; II. (7), *ib.*; III.(2), 232a.; (4, 6), 232b.; V. (28), *ib.*; VII. (28), *ib.*Menander, *Mon.* (572), 219a.Nicander *fr.* (70, 14), 57b.Nicophron (*ap.* Mein. *fr. com.* ii. 2, p. 852), 297b.Orpheus *Argon.* (178, 751, 1068, 114 f.), 270b.*fr.* (xlvii.), *ib.**Hymn.* (lxiv. 6), *ib.**Lith.* (362), *ib.*

Pausanias I. (xxix. 6), 229a.; IV. (xvi. 7), 27a.;

V. (xi. 1), 101b.; (xxvi. 9), 27a.; VII.

(xvii. 3), 27b.; VIII. (xlii. 5), *ib.*; X. (xxi.

1), 101b.; (xxxii. 2), 27b.

Philostratus *Vit. Apoll.* I. (24), 280b.; II. (2, 8,12, 15), 281a.; III. (48), *ib.*; IV. (7, 16), *ib.*;V. (41), *ib.*; VI. (9, 27), *ib.*; VII. (3, 28), *ib.*Pindar *Nem.* II. (1, Schol. on), 37b.; VII. (17), 313a.*Pyth.* I. (18 f.), 313a.; III. (70), 94b.Plato *Alk.* I. (121), 320b.*Apol.* [17 A. (coll. 38 C., 39 B.), 17 C.], 71b.;

(18 B.), 72a.; [19 A. (coll. 21 B., 41 D),

19 C., 23 A., 25 B.], 71b.; (26 D.), 150b.;

297a.; (32 A.), 72a.; (34 A.), 71b.; (34 D.,

36 A.), 72a.; (39 B.), 71b.

Gorg. (502 B.), 150b.; (Cope, App. C.), 71b.*Lysis* (206 E.), 170b.*Phaed.* (61 E., 62 A.), 232b.*Rep.* (546 A.), 131a.*Sophist.* (246 A., 248 A. f.), 233a.*Theact.* (151 D. coll. 149 E.), 27a.; (155 B.),

289b.; (156 A. f.; 165 D.), 233a.; (170 A.-

179 C.), 232b.; (175 A.), 233a.; (182 B.;

192 A.-D.; 195 A.), 289b.

Plotinus (30, 3), 301b.

Plutarch *Alc.* (2), 170b.*Aristid.* (1), 59a.*Cic.* (9), 274a.*De Placit. Phil.* (3, 5, 11), 108b.*De Primo Frigido* (p. 960), 244a.*Mor.* (70 E.), 71b.*Nat. Qu.* (p. 914 F.), 245a*Pcr.* (18), 229b.; (37), 59b.*Sull.* (ch. 28, 1), 152b.Ps. Plut. (*vit.* x. *orat.* p. 848 E.), 297b.

Polybius VII. (9), 42b.; IX. (1, 4), 7a.; XXVII.

(2), 42b.; (13, 7), 170a.; XXX. (7, 2), 170a.

Sappho *fr.* (18, 30, 37, 38), 152b.; (87), 36b.;

(88), 152b.; (95, 99, 106), 92b.; see also 301b.

Sophocles *Ant.* (572 f.), 219a.; (651), 288b.; (1049

Lobeck = 1030 D.), 4a.; (1300), 132-3.

Antig. (215), 204a.; (390 coll. 329; 404, 517), 95a.*El.* (28), 288b.; (564), 240a.; (1289), 95b.;

(1311), 97b.

O. C. (9 f.), 53b.; (29, 1249 coll. 1156), 56a. n.;

(113), 55a.; (433 f.), 55b.; (610 f.), 93b.;

(835 f.), 298a.; (861), 288b.; (907), 95a.;

(1076), 94b.; (1083, 1116), 95b.; (1336),

95a., 288b.

O. T. (20), 54a.; (22 f.), 133b.; (198), 29a.;

(281), 133b.; (284 f.), 96a.; (287, 328 f.),

29a.; (374), 96a.; (420 f.), 95b.; (523), 132b.;

(579), 94b.; (597 f.), 29a.; (719, 792), 95a.;

(810), 51a.; (1031), 94b.; (1054, 1335), 132-3;

(1084 f.), 96a.; (1091), 133b.; (1196), 130a.;

(1221 f.), 29a.; (1512), 95b.; (1512 f.; 1526),

29a.

Ph. (258), 288b.*Tr.* (75), 96b.; (93), 54b. n.; 313a.Stesichorus, *fr.* (92), 163a.

Strabo (vi. 276), 313a.

Teles (*ap.* Stob. vol. ii. p. 66, Teubner), 42b.Theon. *Progym.* (iv. 15), 219b.

- Greek Writers referred to (*continued*)—
 Thucydides I. (3, Shilleto on), 71*b.*; (35), 51*a.*; (76, 77, 82, 90, 101), 231*b.*; (126), 229*a.*; II. (13), 151*a.*; (26), 179*b.*; (40), 71*b.*, 280*a.*; (65), 131*b.*; III. (49), 44*b.*; (55), 96*b.*; IV. (63), 255*b.*; (118), 219*b.*; V. (19), 219*b.*; VII. (87), 129*b.*; VIII. (65), 60*b.*; (66), 224*a.*
 Xenophanes *fr.* (6), 192*b.*
 Xenophon, *De Red.* II. (7), 165*a.*
Hipparch. IX. (5), 230*a.*
 Zosimus III. (15), 281*a.*
 Gregory of Tours, *Historia Francorum*, MSS. of, 146*a.*
 Gretton's *Classical Coincidences*, 74.
Griechische Nominal-Accent, der, Wheeler's, 103 foll.
Griechischen Bühnenalterthümer, die, A. Müller's, 296 foll.
Griechischen Vasen mit Meistersignaturen, die, Klein's, 176.
 Grimm's Wilke's *Clavis Novi Testamenti*, re-edited by Professor Thayer, 106 foll.
 Grote, 34, 149, 150, 151, 228.
Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der Indogermanischen Sprachen, Brugmann's, 62 foll.
 Guardianship, the Attic Law of, Schulthess', 165.
 Güthling's *Ovidii Fasti, Ibis, ex Ponto, Halieutica, Fragmenta*, 157.
P. Vergili Maronis Bucolica Georgica Aeneis, 276.
 Gwatkin's (H. M.) notice of Plummer's *Church of the Early Fathers*, 237.
Hadoardus Cicero-Excerpte, Schwenke's, 110.
 Haebler's *Carmina figurata Gracca*, 304.
 Hager's (H.) notice of Müller's *Greek Theatre*, 296 foll.
 notice of Schulthess' *Vormundschaft nach Attischem Recht*, 165.
 Hannibal's passage over the Alps, 110*a.*, 204*b.*
 Hanno's *Periplus*, 204*b.*
 Hardy's (E. G.) notice of Freeman's *Lectures on History*, 112.
 notice of Godley's *Tacitus*, 154.
 notice of Mommsen's *Römische Geschichte*, vol. v., 60 foll.
 note on Mommsen's *Römische Geschichte*, vol. v., (p. 145), 243.
 Harley MS. 5792, copied from a papyrus, 40.
 Harrow School Archaeological Museum, 285-8.
 Haskins' *M. Annaei Lucani Pharsalia* (with an Introduction by W. E. Heitland), reviewed by Nettleship, 293 foll.
 Haverfield's (F.) note on *cavillor*, 244*b.*
 notice of Cagnat's *Cours élémentaire d'épigraphie latine*, 162.
 notice of Gomme's *Romano-British Remains*, part i., 298 foll.
 Havet's *Cours élémentaire de métrique grecque et latine*, redigé par Louis Duvau, 162.
 Hayter, Rev. John, 185, 187.
 Head's *Historia Numorum: a Manual of Greek Numismatics*, 171 foll.
 Heath's (T. L.) notice of Blass' *Eudoxus* (ed. 2), 272.
 Heberden's (C. B.) Euripides, *Medea*, reviewed by Verrall, 132 foll.
 notice of Chaignet's *Essais de métrique grecque*, 303.
 notice of Duvau's edition of Havet's *Cours élémentaire de métrique grecque et latine*, 162.
 notice of Haebler's *Carmina figurata Gracca*, 304.
 Heitland's (W. E.) edition of the *Pro Rabirio*, 293*a.*
 Introduction to Haskins' *Lucan*, 293-4.
 notice of Dosson's *Étude sur Quinte Curce*, 307.
 notice of Jordan and Haverfield's Relief Map of Syracuse, 73.
 Helbig, 12, 49.
 Henzen, J. W. H. (24 Jan. 1816—27 Jan. 1887), 178.
 Herculanean rolls, 185.
 Herford's Studies in the Literary Records of England and Germany in the Sixteenth Century, 166.
Herodot und Hekataios, by H. Diels, 320*a.*
Herodoti Historiae, vol. i., Libr. i.—iv. Recensuit Alfred Holder, 156.
Herodoti Historiarum, Libr. v.—vi. Scholarum in usum edidit Alfred Holder, *ib.*
 Heslop, George Henry (1822—30 Jan. 1887), 24.
 Hicks' (E. L.) notice of Scott's *Fragmenta Herculaniensia*, 185 foll.
 notice of some political terms in the New Testament, 4, 42.
 Hicks' (R. D.) note on new Materials for the text of Aristotle's *Politics*, 20.
 notice of Bonitz' and Zeller's Plato, 232-3.
 Hildebrandt's *Studien auf dem Gebiete der Römischen Poesie und Metrik*. I. Vergil's *Culex*, 274 foll.
 Hinrich's *Herr Dr. Karl Sittl und die homerischen Aolismen* (*Philologus*, xliii. 1), 35, 91.
Historia Numorum, Barclay V. Head's, 171 foll.
 Historical Study, Lectures on, Freeman's, 112.
 History of Universities, Lectures on the, Laurie's, 113.
 Holden's (Dr.) Cicero *pro Sestio*, 137*b.*
Plutarchi Sullae, 152-3.
 Holder's Herodotus, vol. 1, i.—iv., 156.
 Herodotus, v. vi., for the use of Schools, *ib.*
 Holmes' (Dr.) translation of the works of S. Augustine, 235*b.*
 Holzinger's Nemesii Emeseni libri *περι φύσεως ἀνθρώπου* versio latina, 303.
 Homer, MSS. of, in the British Museum, 38-9
 'greater interpolations' in, 12, 13: cp. p. 37.
 Truth about, Paley's, 269.
 Homer's *Iliad* (vol. i., books i.—xii.), Leaf's, 49-50.
Iliad and Odyssey, Aeolic element in the, G. C. Warr, 35 foll., 91 foll.
Iliad and Odyssey, Introduction to the, Jebb's, 12 foll.
Iliad, Rzach's; *Odyssey*, Cauer's; *Hymns*, &c., Abel's, 198.
 'mead of asphodel,' 238*b.*
Odyssey, i.—xii., Earl Carnarvon's translation of, 159.
Odyssey, vol. i., Morris' translation of, 160.
Odyssey, composed in old age, 301*a.*
 references to Sicily and south Italy, 37*b.*
 solitary allusion to writing (*Il.* vi. 168*ff.*), 93.
 Homeric Dialects, van Leeuwen jun. and Mendes da Costa's, translated into German by Dr. E. Mehler, 199.
 Grammar, Monro's, references to, 36*a.*, 199*a.*
 MSS. (of the *Odyssey*), in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, 319*b.*
 'Realien,' 49*b.*
 Horace, *Carm.* iii. 23, 17*ff.*, 169-70.
Epod. xvii. 32*f.*, 242-3.
A. P. 351-3, 313*b.*
 [See also under 'Latin Writers.']
 Horawitz and Hartfelder's *Briefwechsel des Beatus Rhenanus*, 167.
 'House at Tiryns,' 13*b.*
 Housman's (A. E.) notes on Ar. *Ran.* (1021 coll. Aesch. *Per.* 677 *sqq.*), 313*b.*; Soph. *El.* (564), and Eur. *I. T.* (15, 35), 240-1.
 Huemer's *Virgilii Maronis Grammatici opera*, 158.
hymenaeus, the, 152*a.*
 Hyperides, Funeral Oration of, in the British Museum (Papyrus xcvi.), 39.
 Oration of against Demosthenes respecting the Treasure of Harpalus, in the British Museum (Papyrus cviii.), *ib.*

- Hyperides, Oration of for Lycophron, in the British Museum (Papyrus exv.), *ib.*
the Speech against Aristogeiton I. attributed to 221a.; cp. p. 308b.
- Ἰαχον, 322b.
- Jackson's (Dr.) articles on 'Later Theory of Ideas,' 233a.
translation of the Fifth Book of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, 99a.
- Jadart's *Dom Thierry Ruinart* (1657—1709), 168.
- Jahn's *Persius, Juvenal and Sulpicia*, re-edited by F. Bücheler, 17 foll.
- Ialysos, scarabaeus from, 250a.
- James' (M. R.) note on the δίκαιον, 244b.
- Iasos, excavations at, 176-7, 317a.
- Ideculchre* of Plato, Zeller's, 232.
- Jebb, Jackson and Currey's *Extracts for Translation*, 309.
- Jebb's (R. C.) *Introduction to the Iliad and the Odyssey*, reviewed by Leaf, 12 foll.
Sophocles (Part II. The *Oedipus Colonus*), reviewed by Verrall, 53 foll.
note on A. Müller's *Greek Theatre*, 298.
notice of Schmidt's *Kritische Studien zu den Griechischen Dramatikern*, 93 foll.
- Jevons' (F. B.) *Development of the Athenian Democracy*, reviewed by Cooke, 58 foll.
notice of Bender's *Greek Literature*, 19.
notice of Bergk's *Kleine Philologische Schriften*, edited by Peppmüller, 234-5.
- Ignatian Epistles, Völter on the, 259b.
- Ἰητήραν (Homeric ἱητήρ), 91b.
- Iliad*, interpolations in the, 12, 13, 37.
- Indo-European Grammar, Brugmann's (Erster Band), 62 foll.
- Imhoof-Blumer and Gardner's *Numismatic Commentary on Pausanias*, 101.
- inducere* (= 'to cancel') 67b.
- Inscriptions in the British Museum, 117.
- Interdict *de vi*, the, 66b.
- Introduction to Greek and Latin Metre, Havet's, re-edited by Duval, 162.
to Greek Sculpture, Upcott's, 74; cp. p. 26b.
to Latin Epigraphy, Cagnat's, 162.
to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, Jebb's, 12 foll.
- Johnson's (Dr.) criticism on Milton's Latin Verse, 48b.
- Jordan Henri (30 Sept. 1833—10 Nov. 1886), 24.
(J. B.) and Haverfield's Relief Map of Syracuse, 73.
- Ischiorrhogie*, 47b.
- Isyllus of Epidaurus, 85a.
- Julius Romanos, 'the greatest Christian hymn-writer,' 237b.
- ius apuae* (*ducendae*) *constituere*, 67 a.b.
- Justin Martyr (*Apol.* i. 32; *Dial.* 317 D., 319 A.), 302b.
- Justin, Ruchl's, 75
- Juvenal, difficulties in, 243
Mayor's (Vol. I. fourth edition; Vol. II. third edition), 15 foll.
Pearson and Strong's, 154-5
- Juvenal's account of the *sportula* at variance with Martial, 243
birth, 16.
banishment, *ib.*
relation to Lucan, 293
relations with Martial, *ib.*
satires, date of, 243b.
how far faithful representations of the times, 16, 17.
St. Gall, MS. of, 18a.
text, sources of, 17, 18.
- Juvenci libri Evangeliorum III., Marold's, 158
- καλαύροψ, 36b.
- Kalkmann's *Pausanias der Perieget*, 101 foll.
κάθαρσις—*purgatio*, 223-4.
κατάστασις, 229-30.
κατείδωλον, 108a.
- Keene's (C. H.) *Calpurnius and Nemesianus*, 276
- Kekilius, 301a.
- κεν, the Epic, 91a.
- Kennedy's (Dr.) *Latin Vocabulary*, 74.
note on the derivation of *titulus*, 78-9.
Public School Lat. Gr. on the Conditional Sentence, 136b.
- King's (J. E.) notice of Darmesteter's *La Vie des Mots*, 161.
- Klein's *Die Griechischen Vasen mit Meistersignaturen*, 176
- Kleine philologische Schriften*—Band II. *Zur Griechischen Literatur*—Bergk's, edited by R. Peppmüller, 234-5.
- κλίμαξ, 224b.
- Knoll's *Eugippii Excerpta ex Operibus S. Augustini*, 139 foll.
Vita S. Severini, 224 foll.
- Knoke's *Die Kriegzüge des Germanicus in Deutschland*, 277, 8.
- κόϊλος (κοῖλος). 198b.
- Königsberg School of Homeric Criticism, the, 12b.
- Korsch's *Στέφανος. Carmina sua Graeca et Latina*, 161a.
- Kriegzüge des Germanicus in Deutschland*, die, Knoke's, 277-8.
- Krumbacher's *Griechische Reise*, 237-8.
- La Roche's Homer, 49.
- Langobardic minuscule of the Carolingian Epoch, the, 78b.
- Lateinische Konjugation*, Engelhardt's, 147 foll.
- Latin Alphabet, Pronunciation, and Accentuation, Édon's, 163.
Conditional Sentences, 124, 197, 238, 239.
Conjugation, Engelhardt's, 147 foll.
Epigraphy, Introduction to, Cagnat's, 162.
Examination Papers in Miscellaneous Grammar and Idioms, Stedman's, 309.
Grammar, Reinach's, 200.
Elements of, Édon's, 200.
Pronunciation, the Reformed, 40 foll.
Prose, passages for Translation into, Nettlehip's, 279.
- Syntax, Riemann's, 201.
- Verse, Milton's, on some faults in, 46 foll.
Modern, by Korsch and Ulrichs, 161a.
- Vocabulary, Kennedy's, 74.
- Words in Greek Testament, 196a.
- Latin Writers referred to:—
Ammianus Marcellinus xxvi. (6, 15), 29b.
Apicius vii. (12), 57b.
Apuleius *Met.* ix. (8), 213b; (10), 87a. (10 *coll.* *Tac. Ann.* v. 11; 19), 213b; x. (7), 213b; (10), 87a.; (19, 25, 26), 213b; xi. (3, 20), *ib.*
Arnobius *Adv. Nat.* ii. (48), 57b.; iv. (21), 86b.
- Aseonius *Pro Coraelio Fr. Argum.* 274b.
- Augustine (St.) *Brer. Coll.* iii. (13, 15), 182a.; *Enarr. in ps.* 36 *serm.* 2 § 11, 193a.; *in. ep. Rom. in ch. expos.* T. iii. Pt. ii. p. 925, 43a.; *Serm.* (2 § 4f.; 20 § 4; 32; 37 § 3; 40 § 5; 49 § 10; 56; 214 § 2; 283 § 3; 293 § 3; 300 § 3, 6; 315 § 6; 318 §§ 1, 3; 351; 382 § 3), 236a.
- Ausonius *Epigrams* (128, 11), 304b.
Epitaph. Her. (9, 4), 190b.
Grat. Act. (41), 189a.

Latin Writers referred to (*continued*)—

- Avianus *Phab.* (dedication), 189*b.*; ii. (13), 189*b.*; iii. (4, 11*f.*), 190*a.*; iv. (1 *coll.* viii. 5*f.*, 2, 13), *ib.*; vi. (7), *ib.*; vii. (4), *ib.*; viii. *ib.*; ix. (5), *ib.*; x. (5), *ib.*; x. (11), 190*a.* *b.*; xi. (4, 7), 190*b.*; xii. (1, 9), *ib.*; xiii. (4 *coll.* *Anth. Lat.* 117, 6*R.*, 5), 191*a.*; xiv. (11 from Ennius *Sat.* 45), *ib.*; xv. (1 *coll.* xxix. 5*f.*, 11), *ib.*; xvi. (9*f.*), *ib.*; xvii. *ib.*; xviii. (3*f.*), *ib.*; xviii. (5), *ib.*; xix. (3*f.*), 191*b.*; xx. (5*f.*, 12, 13*f.*), *ib.*; xxi. (5), *ib.*; xxii. 192*b.*; xxii. (5*f.*, 19), 191*b.*, 192*a.*; xxiii. (10), 189*b.*; xxiii. (11*f.*), 192*a.*; xxiv. (4), 192*b.*; xxv. (6), 189*a.*; xxv. (8), 192*b.*; xxvi. (5), *ib.*; xxvi. (11*f.*), 189*a.*; xxviii. (1), 192*b.*; xxix. (14), *ib.*; xxix. (22), 189*b.*; xxx. (7), 192*b.*; xxxi. (7), *ib.*; xxxii. (6), 189*b.*; xxxiv. (3, 5*f.*), 193*a.*; xxxvii. (1), *ib.*; xxxix. (15), *ib.*; xli. (16), *ib.*; xlii. (8), *ib.*
- Caesar *Bell. Civ.* III. (44), 127*b.*
Bell. Gall. I. (14), 201*b.*; IV. (17), 168-9; 233*b.*; V. (26), 138*b.*; (35), 127*b.*; VI. (34), *ib.*
- Catullus vi. (10), 179*b.*; x. (20), 155*b.*; xiv. (17*f.*), 57*b.*; ex. (7), 254*b.*
- Cicero *Acad.* II. (2), 139*b.*; (58), 139*a.*
ad Att. I. (iv.), 69*a.*; (iv. 2), 274*b.*; (xiv. 3), 69*a.*; (xiv. 4), 108*b.*, 268*a.*; (xvi. 11 *coll.* XIV. iii. 2), 79*b.*; IV. (xviii.), 67*b.*, 69*b.*; VIII. (iv. 3), 138*b.*; IX. (xii. 3), 68*b.*; XII. (li.) 68*a.*; XIV. (ii. 1), *ib.*
ad Brut. I. (xvii. 4), 289*b.*
ad Fam. I. (x.) 70*b.*; VI. (xii. 3), 138*b.*; VII. (xiii.), 66*a.*; (xxiii. 2), 69*b.*; IX. (xii.), 274 *b.*; XIII. (lvi.) 44*b.*; XV. (xvi. 3), 67*a.*
ad Herenn. IV. (50, 58), 223*b.*
ad Quint. Fr. I. (i. 2), 69*a.*; (i. 25), 70*b.*; III. (i. 3), 67*a.*; (ix. 8), 69*b.*
Arch. (16), 127*a.* *n.*; (16, 17, 29), 127.
Balb. (3, 5), 138*b.*; (6, 11, 26, 39), 139*a.*; (47, 48, 50), 139*b.*
Brut. (21), 274*b.*; (32), 223*a.*; (36, 66), 223*b.*, (283), 223*a.*; (328), 274*b.*
Caccin. (14, Jordan on), 139*a.*; (63, 92), 66*b.*
Cael. (62), 126*b.*
Cat. I. (17), 127; (18-19), 126*a.*; (29), 127*a.* *n.*; II. (3), 127*a.* *n.*; (12), 127; III. (13), 68*a.*; IV. (7), 169*a.*
Cat. Maior. (4, 13, 16, 27, 28, 49 [*coll.* 33], 58), 136*a.*, (73), 136*b.*
Clu. (16), 126*b.*; (18), 128*a.*; (62), 125*a.*; (80), 126*b.*, 127, 198*a.*; (183), 128*a.*
De Div. II. (20, 127), 125*a.* *n.*
De Domo. (1), 190*b.*
De Fin. I. (7), 126*b.*; II. (83), 74*b.*; (119), 186*a.*; V. (40, Madvig on), 200*a.*
De Imp. Cn. P. (2), 137*b.*; (15), 139*b.*
De Invent. I. (27), 189*b.*
De Nat. Deor. I. (76*f.*), 192*b.*; (97), 191*a.*; II. (48), 70*b.*; III. (79*f.*), 125*a.* *n.*, 239*b.*
De Off. I. (5), 126*a.*; (72), 136*a.*, 139*a.*; (116), 136*a.*; II. (75), *ib.*; III. (50), 126*a.*; (75), 126*b.*; (106), 136*a.*
De Orat. I. (223), 223*a.*; (250), 68*b.*; II. (16), 437*a.*; (240), 289*a.*; III. (48, 186), 86*b.*; (190, 191), 223*a.*
De Prov. Cons. (47), 128*a.*
Div. in Cacc. (32), 128*b.*
Flacc. (21), 69*b.*; (44), 68*a.*; (84), 69*b.*
Lael. (11), 127*a.*; (13), *ib.*
Leg. Agr. II. (10), 138*a.*; (85), 128*a.*
Lig. (9), 137*a.*
Lucull. (38), 110*b.*
Mil. (10), 128*a.*; (28), 125*a.* *n.*; (91), 125*a.*

Latin Writers referred to (*continued*)—

- Mur.* (4, 5), 127; (8, 17), 127*a.* *n.*; (21), 126*a.*; (33), 127; (34), 138*b.*; (44), 223*a.*; (46), 127*a.* *n.*; (80), 125*a.*; (82, 83), 127; (83), 128*b.*
Orat. (36, 38), 223*b.*; (39), 223*a.* *b.*; (42), 223*b.*; (78), 244*b.*; (98, 119), 223*b.*; (137, 137, 173, 175, 199, 231, 234), 223*a.*
Phil. II. (7, 17), 72*b.*; (26), 126*b.*; (xxxii-iii.), 72*b.*; III. (33), 128*b.*; IV. (1), *ib.*; V. (11), 68*b.*
Pis. (2), 69*b.*; (28, 29), 186*a.*; (84), 137*a.*
Planc. (5), 128*a.*; (45), 137*a.*; (47), 223*a.*; (91), 137*a.*
Rosc. Com. (1, 2, 5), 68*a.*
Rull. ii. (70, 98), 67*b.*
Sest. (5), 137*b.*; (14), 127; (16, 17, 22), 137*b.*; (24, 42 [*coll.* 91], 50), 138*a.*; (63, 64 *coll.* *Clu.* 80), 127; (70*f.*, 77), 138*a.*; (81), 127; (84, 110), 138*a.*; (133), 138*b.*; (134), 127; (137), 138*b.*
Top. (79), 224*a.*
Tusc. I. (7), 223*a.*, (48), 86*b.*
Verr. I. (106), 67*b.*; II. (i. 70), 128*a.*; (ii. 15), *ib.*; (ii. 52), 126*a.*; (iii. 91), 128*a.*; (iv. 114), *ib.*; (v. 12), 139*b.*; (v. 98), 138*a.*; III. (31), 126*b.*; (32, 65, 115, 129), 198*a.*; IV. (9), 180*a.*; (xvi. 58), 126*b.*; (70), 128*a.*, 198*a.* *b.*; V. (6), 190*b.*; (48), 68*a.*
- Claudianus *iii. cons. Hon. praef.* (5), 191*b.*
Curtius iv. (11, 4), 190*b.*; v. (5, 12), *ib.*; x. (1, 33), *ib.*
Cyprian *De Lapsis* (c. 36: ed. Hartel, p. 263, 27), 227*b.* *n.*; *Ep.* (lxv. 4: p. 725, 13), *ib.*
Dion Hal. *De comp. verb.* (23), 224*b.*
Ennius *Sat.* (45), 191*a.*
Florus (i. 10, 8), 57*b.*
Frontin. *aq.* (128), 255*b.*
Fulgentius (xiv. l. 23), 289*b.*
Gaius (iv. 141, 155, 161-5), 66*b.*
Gellius xi. (9, 1), 57*a.*; xvii. (2, 16), 255*b.*
Horace *Carm.* II. (v. 21), 128*b.*; III. (xxiii. 17*ff.*, *coll.* xxix. 59*f.*) 169-70; IV. (ix. 39), 51*a.*
Epod. ii. (37), 255*b.*; xvii. (32*f.*), 242-3.
Sat. I. (v. 87), 258*a.*; (viii. 1*ff.*), 192*a.*; II. (iii. 248), 170*b.*
Ep. I. (iii. 26), 127; (v. 30, Obbarius on), 58*a.*; (vii. 93), 127; (xvii. 13, 14, 50), *ib.*; (xix. 18), 127, 128*b.*
Ep. II. (i. 3*f.*), 125*a.*; (ii. 145*ff.*), 127*a.* *n.*
Ars Poet. (41), 16*b.*
- Julius Romanus *ap. Charis* (p. 145, 29), 289*b.*
Justin (29, 4, 5), 139*a.*; (36, 4, 4), 190*b.*
Juvenal I. (49, 95), 243*b.*; (127*ff.*, *coll.* Mart. x. 70, 5-14), 243*a.*; (135), 192*b.*; (135*f.*), 19*a.*; II. (143), 17*a.*; III. (104, *coll.* Lucr. i. 1106, Lachm.), 289*a.*; (322), 15*b.*, 18*a.*; IV. (68), 296*b.*; (69), 191*b.*; V. (38), 18*b.*; (65), 19*b.*; (141), 289*a.*; VI. (167), 18*b.*; (503*f.*), 58*a.*; *subscriptio* ad fin. 18*a.*; VII. (87*ff.*), 16*a.*; (99), 15*b.*; VIII. (67), 18*a.*; (105), 15*b.*, 18*a.*; (148), 15*b.*, 18*a.*, 155*a.*; (157, *Schol.* on), 18*a.*; (241), 289*a.*; X. (8), 192*a.*; (35), 18*a.*; (54, 93, 150), 18*b.*; (191), 289*a.*; (294), 289*b.*; (295), 289*a.*; (357*ff.*), 169*a.*; (365), 192*a.*; XII. (23), 289*a.*; XV. (110).
- Livy I. (xiv. 11), 277*a.*; V. (xlii. 8), 139*a.*; VII (iv. 4; v. 2, 6), 256*a.*; X. (xxxiv. 6), 256*a.*; XXI. (xxxi. 11), 277*a.*; XXII. (i-viii.), 320*b.*; (xxii. 4, Fabri on), 190*a.*; XXIV. (xviii. 14), 68*a.*; XXXII. (x. 6, Drakenb. on), 190*a.*; XXXIX. (xxxvii.), 125*a.*; XLII. (xvii.), 170*a.*; XLV. (xxvi.), *ib.*; *Epit.* (60), 139*b.*; (93), 139*a.*

Latin Writers referred to (*continued*)—

Lucan I. (8 coll. Verg. *Aen.* vii. 461), 293b., 295b.; (19, 50), 295b.; (60 coll. Verg. *Aen.* i. 291), 293b.; (110, 176), 295b.; (187 coll. Verg. *Aen.* ii. 270; 206 coll. *id.* xii. 4), 293b.; (304, 481), 295b.; (530 coll. Verg. *Aen.* v. 851), 293b.; (531), 295b.; (687 = Verg. *Aen.* ii. 337), 294a. II. (32 coll. Verg. *Georg.* i. 42; 236 coll. *Aen.* vi. 390), 294a.; (263), 295b.; (287 coll. Verg. *Aen.* v. 709), 294a.; (288 coll. V. 59; VI. 248; VII. 112; 398, 551; VIII. 420, 800), 295b.; (407 coll. Verg. *Aen.* xi. 405), 294a. III. (68 coll. Verg. *Aen.* i. 531; 98 coll. *id.* iv. 384), 294a.; (358 coll. V. 482), 295b.; (373 coll. Verg. *Aen.* x. 22; 395, 440, coll. *id.* vi. 180), 294a.; (404 coll. Verg. *Ecl.* v. 66), 295b.; (418 coll. *Aen.* ii. 53; 443 coll. *id.* xii. 209), 294a.; (455), 295b.; (470 coll. Verg. *Aen.* xii. 686; 500 = *id.* x. 169), 294a.; (534), 295b.; (542 = Verg. *Aen.* iii. 208), 294a.; (559, 586), 295b.; (607 coll. Verg. *Aen.* iii. 305), 294a.; (609), 295b.; (644 coll. Verg. *Aen.* x. 387), 294a.; (708f.), 295b. IV. (96 = Verg. *Aen.* vii. 113), 294a.; (127), 192b.; (143 coll. Verg. *Aen.* vii. 592), 294a.; (171), 295b.; (427 coll. Verg. *Aen.* x. 288; 796 coll. *id.* ii. 637; 802 coll. *id.* vii. 317), 294a. V. (39 coll. Verg. *Georg.* i. 507; 46 coll. *Aen.* xi. 335), 294a.; (54ff., 109ff.), 296a.; (408 coll. Verg. *Aen.* iv. 309), 294a.; (457), 296a.; (505 coll. Verg. *Aen.* vii. 598; 535 coll. *id.* x. 192), 294a.; (795f.), 296a.; (799 = Verg. *Georg.* iii. 498), 294a. VI. (174 coll. Verg. *Aen.* ix. 510; 228 coll. *id.* i. 209; 274 coll. *id.* i. 105), 294a.; (382, 475), 296a.; (800 coll. Verg. *Aen.* vii. 244), 294a. VII. (2, 141, 199, 257f., 325 coll. *id.* 578, 398), 296a.; (451, 607), 296b. VIII. (332), 296b.; (450 = Verg. *Aen.* ii. 541), 294a.; (837), 296b. IX. (32 = Verg. *Aen.* ii. 198; 73 = *id.* vi. 270), 294b.; (435, 437), 296b.; (471 coll. Verg. *Aen.* i. 101), 294b. X. (110 [coll. Juv. iv. 68], 219), 296b.

Lucilius *fr.* (103, Baehr), 289b.; (585, Baehr), *ib.*

Lucretius I. (1106, Lachm.), 289a. III. (830-1094), 86b. IV. (1259), 57b.

Macrobius *Comm.* I. (ii. 7 coll. 9, 10), 189b.

Sat. VII. (iv. 7 coll. v. 15), 243a.

Manilius II. (886), 190b.

Martial *De Spect.* xv. (8 coll. I. xxv. 6; xxxi, 3; VI. lviii. 10), 85b.

Epigr. III. (lxviii.), 57a.; (xxiii.), *ib.*; (lxiii. 6 coll. Tibull. I. vii. 38), 85b.; (lxxv. 3), 57b. IV. (lxxxvii. 9f.), 57b.; (xci. 1), *ib.* V. (xxx. 3 coll. XIV. clxxxv.), 16b. VIII. (xxx. 6), 57b.; (lxxvi. 7 coll. VI. xxx. 6), *ib.* IX. (lxxxviii. 4f.), 57b. X. (xvii. 8), 56b.; (xxv. 5f.), 58a.; (lxx. 5ff. coll. Juv. i. 127ff.), 243a. XI. (103), 212a.; (cvi. 1), 305b. XII. (*praf.*), 18b. XIV. (cli.), 58a.; (clxxiv. 2 coll. II. lxxxix. 2, 4, 6), *ib.*; (ccxii.), *ib.*; (ccxvii. 1), *ib.*; (ccxviii.), *ib.*

Minucius xxiii. (9), 192b.

Ovid *Her.* XI. (37), 58a.; XV. (85), 190b.

Am. I. (vi. 72), 190a.

A. A. II. (122), 189b.

Epicadion Drusi, 296b.

Paris Genomae (69), 190b.

Met. I. (15), 180a.; (400), 126a. IV. (260), 157a.; VII. (509), *ib.* IX. (179), *ib.*; (191), 200a.; (710), 157a. X. (90), 275a.; (560-704),

Latin Writers referred to (*continued*)—

Ovid *Met.*

320a. XI. (138), 157a. XIII. (114 [coll. 527; *Fast.* iii. 629], 165), 200a.: (183), 240a.; (277, 338, 356), 200a.; (414), 199b.; (451, 457, 503 [coll. IX. 191], 508), 200a.; (509), 199b.; (632, 718), 200a.; (778), 199b. XIV. (104, 133 [coll. 141], 181, 226, 362, 489, 534 [coll. 552], 612 [coll. *Madvig de Fin.* v. 40; Haupt, *Opusc.* iii. 510], 671), 200a.; (791), 243a.; (848), 157a.

Fast. II. (137f., 367f., 638, 835f.), 157b.

III. (629). 200a. IV. (861f.), 157b. V. (435ff.), 164a. VI. (43f.), 157b.; (289), 190b.; (765), 157a.

Trist. I. (i. 79, 88, 125f.), 234b.; (iii. 47), *ib.*

II. (55, 59, 66, 91, 92, 138, 145, 191, 239, 278, 285, 305, 337, 403, 474, 492, 565), 157b. III. (i. 39; iii. 21; iv. 57; v. 53, 55; vi. 16; ix. 32; xi. 43; xii. 2, 28), *ib.*

IV. (i. 21; ii. 53; iii. 42; iv. 34, 76; vi. 13; vii. 18, 23f.), *ib.* V. (v. 45 coll. Mart. XI. ciii.), 212a.; (viii. [11], 157b.; xiii. 19), *ib.*

Ex Pont. I. (vii. 57), *ib.*; (v. 24), *ib.* III. (ii. 21), *ib.*; (iv. 63), 190b. (vi. 34), 157b. IV. (xv. 1), *ib.*

Paulinus *Vit. Amb.* (25), 57b.

Persius *prol.* (14), 48b. V. (175), 289b.

Petronius (67), 57a.

Phaedrus I. (xxii. 6), 57b. III. (xv. Ritter-shusius on), 58a.

Plautus *Amphitr.* *prol.* (95, 121), 148b.

Aul. (559), 308a.; (639), 244b.

Capt. (24, 93, 135, 199, 201, 202, 212), 304b.; (477), 320b.; (690, 693), 304b.

Cure. (621, 662, 712f.), 58a.

Menacch 818 Vahlen, and Ritschl on), 243a.

Mil. Glor. (211), 308 b.; (641 and Ribbeck on), 244b.; (695), 79b.

Most. (251 = 261 R.), 58a.; (862f.), *ib.*

Pers. (57), 205a.

Pseud. (1244 Fleck.), 78b.

Rud. (7, 39, 77, 86), 305a.; (161, 210, 304, 385, 411, 418, 468, 494 [coll. 455], 538 [coll. Ter. *Andr.* 502], 636, 684, 692, 752, 918 [coll. *Capt.* 185]), 305b.; (1093 [coll. 986], 1124, 1138, 1152, 1169, 1170, 1232, 1307, 303a.

Stich. (129), 308b.; (167), *ib.*; (226), 244b.

Trin. prol. (19), 148b.; (107), 308b.; (1059), 58a.

Truc. (221), 148b.; (685), 244b. (730), 288b.

Plin. *Ep.* III. (i. 2), 136a.; (xiv. 7), 190a.

Nat. Hist. praef. 170a. II. (106), 245a. IV. (xii. 22), 37b.; (39), 138b. XIII. (77), 320b. XXXIII. (iii. 45), *ib.* XXXIV. (19), 170a. b.; (57), 3a.

Propertius III. (xviii. 21), 276b. IV. [V.] (iv. 39, 41), 190b.

Quintilian III. (v. 5-7), 224a. IV. (i. 8), 57a; X. (i. 46), 29a.; (i. 60, 63, 65, 69), 213b.; (i. 79), 29a.; (i. 115), 223a.

Sallust *Cat.* li. (20), 169a.

Jug. (lviii.), 139b.; ciii (1), 138b.

Seneca *contr.* (27 § 14), 58a.

de clem. (i. 5, 5), 289b.

de const. sap. (6, 3; 8, 3; 18, 1), *ib.*

de ira (ii. 31 § 4), 190b.

de otio (3 § 3), 19b.

de provid. (4, 3), 289b.; (4 § 12), 190b.

de vita beata (12, 5; 13, 2), *ib.*

dial. (vi. 22 § 6), 127b.

ep. (66 § 8), 57b.; (77 § 8), 57a.

Herc. Oet. (134-172), 289b.

Latin Writers referred to (*continued*)—

- Seneca *nat. quaest.* (i. I § 8), 57*b.*; (iv. 1, 2) 294*b.*
suas. (6 § 27, Sextilius Ena in), 57*b.*
 Sidonius Apollinaris, 16*a.*; (c. 25, 236), 189*b.*
 Silius Italicus *Punic.* III. (259), 177*b.*
 Statius *Silv.* I. (iv. 28-30), 16*b.*; II. (i. 175), 190*b.*; V. (iii. 162), *ib.*
 Strabo (4, p. 203), 130*b.*; XI. (ii.), 270*b.*
 Suetonius *Aug.* (71), 170*b.*; (85), 306*b.*
Caes. (42), 68*b.*
Dom. (6), 244*a.*
Galb. (22), 57*a.*
Nero. (41), *ib.*
 Symmachus *Ep.* I. (101), 189*a.*
 Tacitus *Agric.* (37), 256*a.*; (38 *coll.* Liv. X. xxxiv. 6), *ib.*
Ann. I. (3 *coll.* Liv. VII. iv. 4 : v. 2, 6), *ib.*; (50-51), 277*a.b.*; (57, 63-9), 277*b.* II. (7), *ib.*; (12, 18, 19-21), 278*a.* IV. (50 [*coll.* Liv. 10., xxxiv. 6], 73), 256*a.* XIV. (21), 138*b.*; (37), 256*a.*
dial. de Orat. (10), 29*b.*; (20), 57*a.*
Hist. I. (2, 39, 41, 50, 52, 61, 68 *coll.* II. 93), 154*b.* II. (16 *coll.* 12), *ib.*; (17), 256*a.*; (93), 154*b.* III. (13 *coll.* Liv. X. xxxiv. 6), 260*a.*
 Terence *Andr.* (502), 305*b.*
Haut. (610*f.*), 58*a.*
Phorm. (923), 68*a.*
 Terentianus Maurus (693*f.*), 47*b.*
 Tert. *adv. Marc.* (ii. 2 p.m.), 190*b.*; *apol.* (12), 192*b.*
 Tibullus I. (vii. 38), 85*b.*; (vii. 53, 56), 276*b.*
 Valerius Maximus (7, 3, 7), 139*a.*
 Varro *de l. lat.* (s. 174), 320*b.*
 Vegetius *Mulomedicina, praef.* (3), 243*a.* i. (17, 35), 289*b.*; ii. (16, 2), 138*b.*; (109, 51), 289*b.*
 Vergil *Ecl.* I. (65), 276*a.*; (79), 192*b.* II. (64), *ib.* V. (66), 295*b.* *Georg.* II. (497), 169*b.*; (517, *Philargyr.* on), 180*a.* III. (9), 153*b.*; (13), 192*a.*; (24, 26*f.*, 42, 59, 307, 385 [*coll.* IV. 222]), 153*b.*; (393), 169*b.*; (402, 449), 153*b.* IV. (34, 50, 74), *ib.*; (117), 126*a.*; (165, 222, 227, 291*f.*, 317, 447, 455, 457, 484), 153*b.*; (540), 193*a.* *Aen.* I. (189, 427, 429), 169*b.* II. (448), *ib.* III. (33 *coll.* Lucr. IV. 1259), 289*a.*; (76, Forbiger on), 169*b.*; (411, 448, 454, 484, 605, 670, 674, 683), 289*a.* IV. (242), 258*a.*; (343), 169*b.*; (610), 258*b.* VI. (179), 169*b.*; (579*f.*), 179*b.*; (788), 169*b.* VII. (15*f.*), 192*b.* IX. (119*f.*), *ib.*; (288*f.*), 201*a.*; (388), 169*b.*; (428), 193*a.*; (678, 715), 169*b.* XI. (567), 276*a.* XII. (208), *ib.*; (474, 546*f.*), 169*b.*; (810), 127*a.n.*; (929), 169*b.* *Culex* (1-10 *coll.* *Aetna* and *Georg.* I.), 274*b.*; (26), *ib.*; (48*f.*), 275*b.*; (50, 57, 99, 106, 108), 275*a.*; (137-156), 275*b.*; (172), 276*a.*; (189), *ib.*; (213-222; 232-384 *coll.* *Aen.* vi.), 275*a.*; (412-414), *ib.*
 Laurie's Lectures on the Rise and Early Constitution of Universities, with a survey of Mediaeval Education (A.D. 200-1350), 113.
 Laurentian Sophocles, the, 145*b.*
 Leaf's (W.), *Iliad* (Vol. i. Books i-xii.), reviewed by Merry, 49-50.
 notice of Abel's, Cauer's and Rzach's editions of Homer, 198-9.
 notice of Jebb's *Introduction to the Iliad and the Odyssey*, 12 foll.
 Lehrs' über Madvig's Adversarien und ihren Verfasser, 124.
 Lenormant's *Histoire de la Monnaie dans l'Antiquité*, 172*a.*
 Leskien and the 'young grammarians,' 264*b.*
 Letters from a French University Professor on Classical Education in France, 205, 245, 282.
 Theta and Omikron in Inscriptions, the, 314-15.
 Lewis' (George Cornewall) collation of the Bankes Homer in the Cambridge *Philological Museum* (1832), 39*a.*
 Lex Rubria, the, 158*a.*
 Ursonensis (B.C. 44), the, *ib.*
 Lias' First Epistle of St. John, 71.
 to the Corinthians, 235.
 Liddell and Scott, references to, 44*b.*, 79*b.*, 129*b.*, 196*a.*, 224*a.*, 244*a.*, 280*b.*
 Lightfoot, Bishop, 5*a.*, 71*b.*, 269*b.*
 Linus song, fragment of a, preserved by the Scholiast. on *Il.* xviii. (570), 162*b.*
 Lindsay's (W. M.) notice of Édon's *Écriture et Prononciation du Latin Savant et du Latin Populaire*; *Restitution et Nouvelle Interprétation du Chant dit des Frères Arvales*; *Nouvelle Étude sur le Chant Lémural*, 163.
 Literary Studies in the England and Germany of the Sixteenth Century, Herford's, 166.
littera canina, 121*b.*
 Livy v. vi. vii., Cluer's, revised by P. E. Matheson, 112.
 Madvig and Ussing's, ed. 4 (Vol. ii. Pars. i.), 276.
 Selections from—the Last Two Kings of Macedonia—Rawlins', 72.
 Zingerle's, 277.
 xvii. 17; compared with Appian, (*Maced.* xi. 7, 8), 170.
 λογεῖον, 298*a.*
 λογικὸς συλλογισμὸς—ἐνθύμημα, 99*b.*
 lolarius, 304*a.*
 longa littera, 304*b.*
 Lucan's *Pharsalia*, Haskins', with an Introduction by W. E. Heitland, 293 foll.
 imitated from Seneca, 294*b.*
 Vergil, 293-4.
 MSS. of, 295*a.*
 quoted by Priscian and Probus, 295.
 Scholia on, the, 225*a.*
 the hero of, 293*b.*
 the title of, 294*b.*
 relations to the younger Seneca, *ib.*
 Luceria, the *as librale* of (circ. B.C. 300-252), 163*b.*
 Lucian's *Vera Historia*, 102*a.*
 Lucretius, facsimile of MSS., 231*a.*
 Lupton's (J. H.) notice of Abel's *Orphica* 270-1.
 Lütjohann on the *Cato Maior* (*Rhein. Mus.* xxxvii.), 136*a.*
 Lycophron's *Alexandra*, 304*a.*
 Lygdamis Inscription (B.C. 460-455) in the British Museum, 314-15.
 Macan's (R. W.) notices of Holder's Herodotus, 156-7.
 Mackail's (J. W.) notice of Pomtow's *Poetae Lyrici Graeci Minores*, 152.
 Macrobius *Sat.* vii. 4 § 7, 243*a.*
 Madvig, Johan Nicolai (7 Aug. 1804—12 Dec. 1886) obituary notice of, 123-4.
 letter from (Aug. 1884), 28*a.*
 -Ussing Livy, ed. 4, 276.
 Mahaffy's Alexander's Empire, 203-4.
 Rambles and Studies in Greece, 237.
 Majorca, Excavations at, 316-17.
 Mantinea, excavations at, 317.
 μαρὰν ἀθά, 196*b.*
 Marbles in the British Museum, 117.
 Marcus Aurelius, English translations of, 232.
 Margoliouth's (D. S.) notes on Aristoph. *Achar.* (100); *Vesp.* (355), 204.
 notice of Blaydes' *Aristophanes*, 96 foll.
 Marold's *C. Vettii Aquilini Juvenci libri Evangeliorum IV.*, 158.

- Marsiglio Ficino, 270*a*.
 Martial, Friedländer's, 56 foll.
 Gilbert's, 74.
 illustrated by an Arabic story, 192*a*., 245*b*.
 Martin's *Les Cavaliers Athéniens*, 228 foll.
 Master of Trinity as a Platonic Scholar, the late, 33 foll.
 Matheson's revised edition of Cluer's Livy v. vi. vii., 112.
 Mausoleum, the, Cecil Torr, 79*b*.
 Mayor (John E. B.) Juvenal (Vol. I. fourth edition; Vol. II. third edition), reviewed by Nettleship, 15 foll.
 appeal in behalf of *Archiv. für Lateinische Lexikographie*, 227-8.
 obituary notice of J. N. Madvig., 123-4.
 note on—
 Apsyrtus, 243*a*.
 Hor. *A. P.* (351 ff.), 313*b*.
 John Clement, 244*b*.
 Macrobi. *Sat.* vii. (4 § 7), 243*a*.
 notice of—
 Baehrens' *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum*, 74.
 Minucius Felix, 75.
 Daremberg and Saglio's *Dictionnaire des Antiquités grecques et romaines*, 201.
 Ellis' (Robinson) *Avianus*, 188 foll.; cp. 245*b*.
 Friedländer's *Martial*, 56 foll.
 Gertz' *Seneca*, 19.
 Gilbert's *Martial*, 74.
 Holzinger's *Nemesius*, 303.
 Huemer's *Virgilius Grammaticus*, 158.
 Jadart's *Memoirs of Ruinar*, 168.
 Kennedy's *Latin Vocabulary*, 74.
 Lexicons to *Caesar*, 111.
 Marold's *Juvenius*, 158.
 Meister's *Quintilian*, 155.
 Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 158-9.
 Peiper's *Ausonius*, 75.
 Petschenig's *Corippus*, 158.
 Ruehl's *Justin*, 75.
 Wagener's *Festus*, 158.
 Wendland's *Quaestiones Musonianae*, 74.
 Mayor's (Joseph B.) *Cicero De Natura Deorum*, 186*a*., 187*b*.
 criticisms on Paley and Sandys' *Demosthenes* (*Journal of Philology*, vi. 210-252), 14*b*.
 note on Aristoph. *Achar.* (36), 115.
 note on Conditional Sentences in Latin, 239.
 McClellan's *Greek Testament*, 107*a*.
 Mehler's translation of Van Leeuwen, jun. and Da Costa's *Der Dialect der homerischen Gedichte*, 199.
 Meister's *Quintilian*, 155-6.
 Mélanges Renier, 301-9.
 Melbourne University, Supplementum to Plantus' *Aulularia*, written for the Students of, April 21, 1887, by T. G. Tucker, 310 foll.
 μέλειη, 221*a*., 224*a*.
Memoirs of Ruinar, Jadart's, 168.
 —μεναι, —μεν, the infinitive terminations, 37*a*., 91*a*.
 Menge and Preuss' *Lexicon Caesarianum*, 111.
 mordo, mormordi, mordo, 148.
 Merk's (Charles) notice of Funk's *Doctrina Duodecim Apostolorum*, 302.
 Merquet's *Lexicon zu der Schriften Cäsars und seiner Übersetzer*, 111.
 Merovingian writings, 141*a*.
 Merry's (W. W.) notice of Leaf's *Iliad*, 49-50.
 μέσπα (μέσπα). μέσποδι, μέσπε, 92*a*.
 μέθεξις, Plato's doctrine of, 233*a*.
 Methods of Historical Study, and Chief Periods of European History, Freeman's, 112.
 Meusel's *Lexicon Caesarianum*, 111.
 Middleton's (Prof.) *Rome*, 153*a*.
 Miélot's *Miracles de Nostre Dame*, MSS. of, 147*b*.
 Milton's Latin Poetry, on some faults in, 46 foll.
 μίμησις, the Platonic, 233*a*.
 Minucius Felix, Baehrens', 75.
 Modern Greek, Zompolidēs' Course of, 113.
 Mommsen's reprint of Bruns' *Fontes iuris Romani antiqui*, 157-8.
 Römische Geschichte (Fünfter Band), 60 foll.
 (V. p. 145), note on, 243-4.
 Staatsrecht, translated by P. F. Girard, 165-6.
 Monro's *Homeric Grammar*, references to, 36*a*., 199*a*.
 review of Van Leeuwen, jun. and Da Costa's *Der Dialect der homerischen Gedichte*, 199.
Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 158-9.
 Morris' *Odyssey of Homer*, Vol. I., 160.
 MSS. at Patmos, two, 281.
 in the British Museum, Early Classical, 38 foll.
 of Avianus, 189*b*.; Corbey of S. James, 268;
 Eugippius (*excerpts*) 141; (*vita S. Severini*) 225; Euripides, 273*a*.; Lucan, 295*a*.; Persius, 17*b*.; Plautus, 304 foll.
 [See *Album Paléographique, Chatelet, Codex, Fragmenta Herculanensia* and *Hadoardus*.]
 Müller's (C. F. W.) *Cicero*, text, 136 foll.
 Müller's (Albert) *Greek Theatre*, 296 foll.
 Mullinger's *History of Cambridge*, 113*a*.
 Schools of Charles the Great, *ib*.
 Munro (H. A. J.), emendations of, 74*b*., 100*b*.
 Friedländer's dedication to, 56.
 references to, 57*b*., 276*b*.
 Murray (A. S.) on an Archaic Greek Vase, 315-16.
 on Myron's *Pristae*, 3-4.
Museum Marbles (pt. xi. p. 36), note on the, 313*b*.
Musonianae Quaestiones, Wendland's, 74.
 μυστήριον, 107-8.
 Myron's *Pristae*, 3: cp., 115.
 ν ἐφελευστικὸν before *F*, 198*b*.
 Napoleon III., (*Jules César* iii. 7 § 3) on *Caesar Bell. Gall.* iv. (17), 168*a*. *b*., 242.
 Narducci on the Hadoardus MS. of *Cicero*, 110*a*.
 Nasals and liquids + sigma, 259*a*.
 navicularii, 267*b*.
 ναυκραρία, 229.
 νηλεές, 322*b*.
 Nemesianus and Calpurnius, *Eclogues* of, Keene's, 276.
Nemesii Emeseni libri περί φύσεως ἀνθρώπου versio latina, Holzinger's, 303.
 Nettleship (H.) *Passages for Translation into Latin Prose*, 279-80.
 notice of Boelte's *De Artium Scriptoribus Latinis*, 278-9.
 notice of Haskins' *Lucan*, 293 foll.
 notice of Mayor's *Juvenal*, 15 foll.
 notice of Reitzenstein's *Ferriarische Forschungen*, 307-8.
 Neumann and Partsch's *Physikalische Geographie von Griechenland*, 203.
 New Books published in England: 30, 88, 122, 182, 214, 260, 291, 322.
 on the Continent: 31, 88, 122, 182, 214, 260, 292, 322.
 New Materials for the text of Aristotle's *Politics*, 20.
 Testament, on some Political terms employed in the, 4 foll., 42 foll.
 Niejahr (*Quaest. Arist. Scen.*) on the *περίπλοκ.* 298*b*.
 Nisyros, Marble inscription at, 82*b*.
 Nixon's (J. E.) notice of Poirēt's *Eloquence judiciaire à Rome pendant la République*, 273-4.
 Nohl's *Cicero—Oratio pro Sec. Roscio Amerino*; in *Q. Caecilius Divinatio*, in *C. Terrem Accusationis*, Lib. iv. v., 135-6.

- νομοφύλακες, 297*b*.
Notes on Conditional Sentences in Latin, 124, 197, 238-9.
Notice sur un Manuscrit Mérovingien d'Eugippius, 141*a*.
Nouveau Traité de Diplomatique, the, 145*a*.
Nouvelle Étude sur le Chant Lémural, Edon's, 163-4.
Numismatic Commentary on Pausanias, Imhoof-Blumer and Gardner's, 101.
Oberhummer's Akarnania, Ambrakia &c., 279.
Obituary notices:—
Desjardins, Ernest, 24.
Henzen, J. H. W., 178.
Heslop, George Henry, 24.
Jordan, Henri, 24.
Madvig, Johan Nicolai, 123.
Schafer, Carl, 178.
von Gutschmidt, Freiheer Hermann Alf., *ib*.
obsignare tabulas, 69*b*.
Officina dei Papiri at Naples, the, 185*a*.
'Oil upon troubled waters, to pour,' 245.
Oman's (C. W. C.) notice of Percy Gardner's *Peloponnesus*, 248-9.
Onions' (J. H.) note on Hor. *Epod.* xvii. (32), 242-3.
notice of Schoell's *Plautus' Captivi*, 304.
notice of Schoell's *Plautus' Rudens*, 305-6.
opisthographi, 320*b*.
oppido desperare, an un-Ciceronian phrase, 137*a*.
oratio commentata, 224*a*.
ὄρχαμος ἀνδρῶν, 36*b*.
ὀρχήστρα, 297-8.
Ordericus Vitalis' autograph MS. of, 147.
Orpheus, *Hymnus in Isin*, 270*a*.
Vincent's annotated copy of Gesner's, 270*b*.
Wiel's *Observationes* (1853), *ib*.
Orphica, recensuit Eugenius Abel, 270.
Orvieto, excavations at, 117*a*.
οὔδατα (Boeotian for *ὑδατα*), proposed by Verrall on Aesch. *Theb.* 259 (= 273 Dindorf), 53*a*.
Ovid, *Carmina Selecta*, Sedlmayer's, 157.
Fasti, Tristia, Ibis, Ex Ponto, Halieutica, Fragmenta, Güthling's, *ib*.
Metamorphoses, Zingerle's, *ib*.
Metamorphoses, xiii., xiv., Simmons', 199-200.
MSS. of, 157.
Tristia, book i., Owen's, 234.
[See also under 'Latin Writers.']
Owen's (S. G.) Ovid's *Tristia*, book i., 234.
notice of Güthling's *Vergil*, 276.
notice of Güthling's, Sedlmayer's and Zingerle's edition of Ovid, 157.
notice of Simmons' Ovid's *Metamorphoses* xiii. xiv., 199-200.
Oxford University Intelligence: 21, 77, 171, 183, 208, 215, 285, 314.
Page's (T. E.) note on Hor. *Carm.* III. xxiii., 17*ff*., 169-70.
'Problem in N. T. Criticism,' 319*b*.
Palaeography in France, 145 foll.
Paléographie des Classiques Latins, collection de *Faustimiles*, Chatelain's, 230.
Palestine, coins of, in the Albert Hall, 117*a*.
Paley and Sandys' *Demosthenes* (second edition), 14-15.
Paley's *Truth about Homer*, 269-70.
Pallis' (Alex.) note on Aesch. *Agam.* (301), 204*a*.
Panathenaic prize vases, 316*a*.
πανθυμαδόν (cp. *δηοθυμαδόν*), 92*a*.
Pantikapaean mint, the, 174*a*.
Papyri in the British Museum, 38-9.
par impar (*ἀρτιασμός*), 170.
παράλησις (deprecatio), 223*b*.
παρασκευάζειν, 187*b*.
'paroemiac,' the, 162*b*.
Parum cavisce videtur (Hor. *A. P.* 351*ff.*), 313*b*.
πάσχα, 196*a*.
Passages for Translation into Latin Prose, Nettle-ship's, 279-80.
Patmos, archaeological researches at, 82*b*.
library of monastery of St. John, 237*b*, 281*b*.
two MSS. at, 281.
Paton's (W. R.) note on excavations at Iasos, 176-7.
note on excavations at Smyrna, 82-3.
Pausanias der Perieget, Kalkmann's, 101.
Pausanias' alleged sources of information, 102-3.
Description of Greece, Shilleto's translation, 101.
Peacock's *Observations on the Cambridge Statutes*, 113*a*.
Pearson and Strong's *Juvenal*, 154-5.
Pearson's (A. C.) note on Dem. *Androt.* (p. 606, § 44), 77.
Peile's (J.) note on *στρίταυος* (Fest.)—*tritauos*, 205.
note on *titulus*, 79*b*.
notice of Wheeler's *Der Griechische Nominal-Accent*, 103 foll.
Peiper's *Ausonius*, 75.
Pelham's (H. F.) notice of Schiller's *Geschichte der Römischen Kaiserzeit* (Band II.), 266 foll.
Peloponnesus, Clark's, 20.
Percy Gardner's, coins of, 248-9.
πεντακοσιομέδιμνοι, the, 59*a*.
Peppmüller's selections from Bergk's *Kleine philologische Schriften*, 234-5.
περί ὕψους, of Longinos, 300 foll.
φύσεως ἀνθρώπου Nemcsii Emcseni libri versio latina, 303.
περίακτοι, 298*b*.
Periodicals, Summaries of. See under 'Summaries.'
Perizonius, 189*a*.
περπερεύεσθαι, 105*b*.
perscribere, perscriptio, 68*a*.*b*.
Persius, Juvenal and Sulpicia, Otto Jahn's, edited by Bücheler, 17.
MSS., 17*b*.
Scholia, 17*a*.
Person's Tacitus, *Annals* (1883), *Historics* (1880), 154.
Peskett's *Cicronis Oratio Philippica Secunda*, 72.
explanation of Caesar's Bridge over the Rhine, 168.
Petrie's (W. M. Flinders) note on *Miscellanea from Egypt*. 209-10.
Petronius' parody of Lucan, 224*b*.
Petschenig's *Gresconius Corippus*, 158.
Φαρισαῖος, 196*a*.
φάσις μισθώσεως οἴκου, 165*a*.
Pheidôn of Argos, 172*b*.
φῆρες (= *θηρες*: cp. *fera*), 36*b*.
φιλήμεναι, κιχήμεναι, &c., 36*a*.
Philodemus, 186-7.
Philological Society, Abstract of Proceedings of (5 Nov. 1886—18 Mar. 1887), 179*a*.
Cambridge, 23*b*.
communications to, 24*b*.
Proceedings of, 133*b*.
Philonides, 273.
Philostratus, *Vita Apollonii* (i. 24; iv. 7), 280-1.
Photius s.v. *ναυκραρία*, 229*a*.
νομοφύλακες, 297*b*.
ὀρχήστρα, *ib*.
φρατρία, Etymology of, 60*b*.
Physikalische Geographie von Griechenland, Neumann and Partsch's, 203.
Pindar, *Nem.* vii. 17, note on, 313*a*.
πίστρες, 36*a*.
Pithocanus MS. of Juvenal, Beer's collation of, 17*b*., 155*a*.
Plaidoyers Politiques de Demosthène, Weil's, 218 foll.

- Plato and Marcus Aurelius for English Readers, 232.
 Plato's *Apology*, Adam's, 71.
 Crito, and parts of the *Phædo* translated for English Readers, 232.
 dialogues, chronology of, 233*a*.
Gorgias and *Phædrus*, Thompson's editions of, 34*b*.
Republic, translations from for English Readers, 232.
Ideenlehre, Zeller, 232; Jackson, 233*a*.
Philebus, Thompson's 'Introductory Remarks' on, 34*a*.
Sophist and *Politicus*, authenticity of, 33*b*
 [See also under 'Greek Writers.']
Platonische Studien, Bonitz, 232-3.
 Platt's (Arthur) note on ἀρετή, 280.
 Philostratus, *Vita Apollonii* (i. 24; iv. 7), *ib*.
 Plautus' *Aulularia*, Supplementum to, written for the students of Trin: Coll: Melbourne, 310 foll.
Captivi, Schoell's, 304.
Mil. Glor. 695, note on, 79*b*.
 MSS., 304-5.
 facsimiles of, 231*a*.
Rudens, Schoell's, 305-6.
 [See also under 'Latin Writers.']
 Plays acted at Cambridge in the 16th century, 166*b*.
 πλῆθος, φρατρίαι, γέννη, 59*b*.
 Plummer's (A.) Church of the Early Fathers (external history), 237.
 notice of Chase's Chrysostom, 236.
 Chrysostom *De Sacerdotio*, Seltmann's, 303*a*.
 Lias' First Epistle of St. John, 71.
 to the Corinthians, 235.
 Scrivener's Greek Testament, 70.
 Weymouth's Greek Testament, *ib*.
 Woods' and Johnston's translation of St. Augustine's Anti-Pelagian Treatises, 235.
Plutarchi De Proverbiis Alexandrinorum libellus inciditus, Crusius', 272.
Sulla, Holden's, 152-3.
 [See also under 'Greek Writers.']
Postæ Lyrici Græci Minores, Pomtow's, 152.
Postarum Latinorum Fragmenta, Bachrens', 74.
 Poiret's Eloquence judiciaire à Rome pendant la République, 273-4.
 Polemon, Pausanias' alleged authority on archaeology, 102*b*.
 Poli-tis-Chrysokhou, excavations at, 25*f*., 316*f*.
 Polyclethus' Astragalizontes, 170.
 Pomtow's *Postæ Lyrici Græci Minores*, 152.
 πόρδαλις, 36*a*.
 πόρρω, 188*a*.
 Porson's canons, 50*b*., 303*b*.
 Postgate (J. P.) on the Reformed Pronunciation of Latin, 40 foll.
presumere (= 'to presume, arrogate'), 193*a*.
 Preuss' Vollständiges lexikon zu den pseudocæsariischen Schriftwerken, 111.
 Priem (Dr.) on Conditional Sentences, 125*a*.n., 126*b*., 127*a*.n.
 Prius (Dr.) on the Epistle to the Galatians, 119.
 πρίνας = χερῶν τοῦς δεσμούς (Hesychius), 4*a*.
 πρισθεις = δεσμευθεις (coll. Soph. *Al.* 1019 Lobbeck), Suidas, *ib*.
 πρίων = ἀγοράζων (Hesychius), 3*b*.
 Pristæ of Myron, the, 3-4.
Prohibet, the, 84*a*.
Prochyla alta (Verg. *Aen.* ix. 175), note on, 169.
Pronunciation of Latin, 40 foll.
 Propertius and Tibullus, Ramsay's selections from, 276.
 Proposed scheme for a classified catalogue of MSS. of Classical Authors, 217-18.
 προστάτις, 6*b*.
 Proverbs:—
 ἀγορὰ Κερκώπων, 3*b*.
 οὐδέν σ' ὀνήσει βολβὸς ἂν μὴ νεῦρ' ἔχῃς, 57*b*.
 'To pour oil upon troubled waters,' 245*a*. *b*.
 of Alexandria, 272*a*.
 Prudentius, the Paris, 146*a*.
 Pulpit Commentary, the: Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians, 71.
 Punic War, the Second, Arnolds (edited by W. T. Arnold), 109-110.
purgatio (κάθαρσις), 224*a*.
 Purser's (L. C.) notice of Fränkel's edition of Boeckh's *Die Staatshaushaltung der Athener*, 149 foll.
Quæstiones Diodoræ Mythographicæ, Bethe's, 273.
Musonianæ, Wendland's, 74.
 Quintus Curtius, Dosson's, 307.
 Quintilian, Meister's, 155-6.
 Ramsay's (G. G.) selections from Tibullus and Propertius, 276.
 (W.) Prosody, 47*a*. *b*.
rana esculenta, 20.
 temporaria, *ib*.
 Randell's (T.) notice of Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians in the Pulpit Commentary, 71.
 Rawlins' selections from Livy, 72.
 Regnier's *De la latinité des sermons de Saint Augustin*, 235-6.
 Reid's (J. S.) note on Conditional Sentences, 127*a*. n.
 on Rutilius Claudius Namatianus (ii. 47, 8), 78*b*.
 notice of Schwenke's *Des Hudoardus Cicero-Excerpte*, 110.
 notice of C. F. W. Müller's Cicero, 136 foll.
 notice of Schiche's and Nohl's editions of Cicero, 135-6.
 Reinach's *Grammaire Latine*, 200-1.
 note on excavations at Delphi, 82.
 Reitzenstein's *Verrianiſche Forschungen*, 307-8.
 Relief Map of Syracuse, Jordan and Haverfield's, 73.
 Renier, *Mélanges*, 308-9.
 'Report to H.M.'s government on the Greek MSS. yet remaining in libraries of the Levant, London 1858,' 273*a*.
 Reports on Archaeology, 25, 80, 117, 171, 209, 248, 285, 314.
Restitution et Nouvelle Interprétation du Chant dit des Frères Arvales, Edon's, 163.
 Resultant Greek Testament, Weymouth's, 70.
 Revised Version, the, 108-9.
 Westcott on the, 179*a*, 212*b*, 319*b*.
 in Germany, 84*a*.
 Rhenanus' Correspondence, Horawitz and Hartfelder's, 167.
 Rhetoric of Cicero, Causeret's, 222 foll.
 subdivisions of:—*inventio*, *dispositio*, *elocutio*, *actio*, *memoria*, 222*b*.
Rhodes in Modern Times, Cecil Torr's, 249.
 Richards' (H.) notice of Stock's *Nicomachean Ethics*, 152.
 Ridgeway's (W.) note on Pindar, *Nem.* vii, (17), 313*a*.
 Riemann's *Syntaxe Latine*, 201.
 Rise and Early Constitution of Universities, Laurie's Lectures on the, 113.
 Roach Smith, 299*b*.
 Roberts' (Dr.) *Discussions on the Gospels*, 197*b*.
 (E. S.) *Greek Epigraphy*, 315*b*.
 (W. Rhys) notice of Crusius' Plutarch *De Proverbiis Alexandrinorum*, 272.
 (W. Rhys) notice of *Mélanges Renier*, 308-9.
 Robinson's (J. Armitage) notice of Two MSS. at Patmos, 281.

- Roby's (H. J.) *Latin Grammar*, references to, 125, 126, 148, 197-8, 238-9.
 note on Caesar's Bridge over the Rhine, 242.
 notice of Bruns' *Fontes iuris Romani antiqui*, 157-8.
 notice of Gasquy's *Cicéron Jurisconsulte*, 73.
 notice of Riemann's *Syntaxe Latine*, 201.
 notice of Sonnenschein's notes on the Conditional Sentence in Latin, 197-8.
 notice of Tyrrell's Letters of Cicero, on points of Law, 66 foll.
 Roman Altar at South Shields (*Academy*, 30 April, 7 May), 177*a*.
 Law, points of, in Tyrrell's edition of Cicero's Letters, 66 foll.
 Romano-British Remains, Part I., Gomme's, 298 foll.
 Römische Geschichte, Mommsen's, Vol. V. (p. 145), note on, 243-4.
 Geschichte, Mommsen's, Vol. V., notice of, 60 foll.
 ροῦγα, ῥῶγες, *ruga*, 13*b*.
 Ruehl's *M. Iuniani Iustini epitoma*, 75.
 Ruinart, Jadart's Memoirs of, 168.
 Rutherford's (W. Gunion) notes on the Scholia of the *Plutus*, 78, 242.
 (W. Gunion) notice of Briel's *De Callistrato et Philonide*, 273.
 Rutilius Claudius Namatianus II. 47, 8, note on, 78*b*.
 Rzach's *Homeri Iliadis Carmina*, 198.

 Saalfeld's *Thesaurus Italo-Græccus*, 85*a*.
saccula (*sacculum*), "fashion, manners," 296*b*.
 Sahidic Acts of Andrew and Paul, the fragmentary, 244*b*.
 σάλω, 87*a*.
 Sallust, *Cat.* (51, 20), Caesar's speech in behalf of the Catilinarians, 169.
 facsimile MSS. of, 231*a*.
salutatio confounded with the *sportula*, 243.
 Sampi, San, Sigma, 315*a*.
 Sanday's (W.) note on Tischendorf's *Evangelium Palatinum* (p. xxi.), 281*a*.
 notices of the Vienna *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, 139 foll., 224 foll.
 Sanhedrin, origin of the word, 44*a*.
 Sandys and Paley's *Demosthenes*, 14-15.
 Sandys' *Easter Vacation in Greece*, 237-8.

 note on Greek Frogs, 20.
 notice of Causeret's *Étude sur la langue de la rhétorique et de la critique littéraire dans Cicéron*, 222 foll.
 notice of Wotke's *Demosthenis Orationes selectae*, 271.
 Sapphic Metre, the, 92*b*.
 Sappho's *Epithalamion*, *ib*.
 Sassanid Kings imitated by Diocletian, 276*a*.
satisfactio = "amends for a fault," 227*b*.
 Saturnian verse, the, 92*a*., 162*b*.
 Scarabæus from Ialysos, 250*a*.
 σκηνή, 297-8.
 Schaper, Carl (15 Mar. 1828—6 Oct. 1886), 178.
 Scheme for a Catalogue of Greek and Latin Classical MSS., 217-18.
 Scherer's *Zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*, 264*b*.
 Schiøche's Cicero—*Cato maior de Senectute*; *Laelius de Amicitia*; *de Officiis*—135-6.
 Schiller's *Geschichte der Römischen Kaiserzeit* (Band II.), 266 foll.
 Schliemann's (Dr.) Trojan treasure, 172*b*.
 Schmidt's *Kritische Studien zu den Griechischen Dramatikern*, 93 foll.
 Schoell's Plautus' *Captivi*, 304.
Rudens, 305-6.
schola, 75*b*.
 VOL. I.

 Scholia to Cathedral, from, G. Baldwin Brown's, 75*b*.
Scholia in Euripidem, Schwartz', Vol. I., 272-3.
 Scholia of the *Plutus*, notes on the, 78, 242.
 Schubert's text and translation of Pausanias, 101*b*.
 Schulthess' *Vormundschaft nach Attischen Recht*, 165.
 Schwartz' *Scholia in Euripidem*, Vol. I. (scholia in Hecubam Orestem Phoenissas), 272-3.
 Schwenke's *Des Hadoardus Cicero-Excerpte*, 110.
scolion, the, 152*a*.
 Scott's (W.) article on Philodemus *περὶ θεῶν διαγωγῆς* in *J. of Philology* (xii. p. 245), 187*a*.
Fragmenta Herculaneisia, 185 foll.
 Scrivener's *Greek Testament* (enlarged edition), 70.
 Seaton (R. C.) on the Astragalizontes of Polyclethus, 170.
 on the meaning of γλυφίδες, 244.
 Sedlmayer's *Ovidii Carmina Selecta*, 157.
 Selinus, archaic metopes from, 3*b*.
 σέλις (*pagina*), 320*b*.
 Seltmann's Chrysostom *de Sacerdotio*, 303.
 Seneca, Gertz's, 19.
 [See also under 'Latin Writers.']
 Shilleto's (A. R.) translation of Pausanias, 101.
 Shilleto's (R.) Demosth. *De Falsa Legatione*, 14*a*.
 Thucydides, 71*b*., 231*b*.
 Sicard's *Études classiques avant la Révolution*, 167.
Sicyonica of Menæchmus, the, 102*b*.
 Sidgwick's (A.) "Greek and Latin Classics v. English Literature," 8 foll.: cp. 83.
Lectures on Greek Prose, 73-4.
P. Vergili Maronis Georgicon Libri III. IV., 153.

 notice of Bryans' Caesar, *Bell. Gall.* IV., 233-4.
 notice of Jebb, Jackson and Currey's *Extracts for Translation*, 309.
 notice of Owen's Ovid, *Trist.* I., 234.
 notice of Stedman's *Latin Ex. Papers*, 309.
 Sidon, excavations at, 117*a*., 318*a*.
 Sidonius Apollinaris, on the exile of Juvenal, 16*a*.
 σίδρωσ (= σφίδρωσ: cp. *sudor*, *sweat*), 301*b*.
 sigma in combination with nasals and liquids, 259*a*.
 Simias, 304*a*.
simul = ἄμυδ-ις (?), 87*a*.
 Sittl's *Die Aiolismen der Homerischen Sprache* (*Philologus*, xliii. 1), 35 foll.
 Skeat (Prof.) s. v. *Title*, 78*b*.
 Smith's (A. H.) note on British Museum Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities, 118-9.
 (Cecil) acquisitions of the British Museum 25 foll., 80, 117, 244, 316.
 note on a marble inscription at Nisyros, 82.
 antiquities at Patmos, *ib*.
 archaeological finds at Cyprus (cp. pp. 25-6), Iasos, Majorca, Minorca, Mantinea, Sidon, Thasos, Tiryns, Trieste, 317-18.
 archaic fibulæ, with incised designs, 115.
 Furni—four islets near Samos, 82.
 the Chaeroneia lion, 317.
 the Egyptian Exploration Fund, *ib*.
 notice of Harrow School Museum—Budge's and Torr's Catalogues, 283.
 Upcott's *Introduction to Greek Sculpture*, 74.
 Smyrna, excavations at, 82-3.
 Snow's (T. C.) notice of Brugmann's *Indo-European Grammar*, 62 foll.
 of Paley's *Truth about Homer*, 269-70.
 Socrates, a translation of the *Apology*, *Crito*, and parts of the *Phædo* 232.
 talks with, from the *Gorgias* and *Republic*, *ib*.
 Sonnenschein's (E. A.) notes on Conditional Sentences, 124, 238.

Sonnenschein's (E. A.) notice of Édons (Lhomond's)
Éléments de Grammaire Latine, 200
 Reinach's *Grammaire Latine*, *ib.*
 Sonntag's *Ueber die Appendix Vergiliana*, 306-7.
 Sophocles, Campbell and Abbott's, 132 foll.
El. 564, 240.
 Jebbs: Part II. The Oedipus Coloneus, 53 foll.
 [See also under 'Greek Writers.']
 Sorof's (Dr.) editions of Cicero, 306.
 Sosibius, Pausanias' alleged authority for Sparta,
 102*b.*
Speculum of St. Augustine, the so-called, 140*a.*,
 268*a.*
Spicilegium Juvenalianum, Beer's, 17*b.*
 "Sporadic Variation," 63*a.*
Sportula, the, 243
 σσ, symbol to denote, in inscriptions, 315*a.*
 St. John, Lias' First Epistle of, 71.
 of Patmos, Monasterial Library of, 237*b.*,
 281*b.*
Staatshaushaltung der Athener, die, Boeckh's,
 Frankel's edition of, 149 foll.
 Stangl's (Dr.) Editions of Cicero, 306.
Starein = ἑστῆσα, 148 *b.*
Stas, *stat*, said to be aorist forms *ib.*
Status causarum, 222*a.*
 Stedman's Latin Examination Papers, 309.
stellati = *cancellati* (Lucan iii. 455), 295*b.*
 Stephenson's (H. M.) note on difficulties in Juvenal, 243.
 notice of Cluer's Livy V., VI., VII. (revised by
 Matheson), 112
 notice of Madvig-Ussing's Livy, 276.
 Zingerle's Selections from Livy, 277.
 Stöbile's *M. Tulli Ciceronis de Oratore Lib. Prim.* 306.
 Stock's *Nicomachean Ethics*, 152.
 Stone's (E. D.) *Carmen Saeculare* Graece redditum,
 114.
 Story of the Nations:—
 (a). Alexander's Empire, Mahaffy's, 203.
 (b). Carthage, Church's, 204.
stritauos (Fest.): *tritauos*, 205.
 'strophic correspondence,' Verrall on, 50*a. b.*
Studia Biblica. Essays in Biblical Archaeology and
 Criticism, and kindred subjects. By Members of
 the University of Oxford, 194 foll., 268-9.
Studien auf dem Gebiete der Römischen Poesie und
Metrik. I. Vergil's *Culex*, Hildebrandt's, 274 foll.
Sublimity of Style, Dionysos (or Longinos) on, 300 foll.
subscribere, *scriptio*, 70*a.*
 σύμβολα, σημεία, and εἰκότα, 99*a. n.*
 Summaries of Periodicals:—
 Academy (22 Jan.—26 Feb.), 83; (23 Apr.—7
 May), 177, 178; (14 May), 179; (21 May—
 18 June), 212; (25 June—10 Sept.), 254;
 1—15 Oct.), 288; (22 Oct.—29 Oct.), 319.
 Ἀμαθία (21 Jan.), 82.
 American Journal of Archaeology (1887, vol. iii.
 nos. 1, 2), 287.
 Journal of Philology (vol. viii. 2, 1887), 319.
 Annuaire de la Société française de Numismatique
 (Jan., Feb.), 110; (Mar.—June), 253; (Sept.,
 Oct.), 318.
 Antike Denkmäler (Band i. erstes Heft.), 250.
 Antiquarian, Walford's (May), 179.
 Archaeological Journal (xlv. 1, 2, 173, 174), 318.
 Archäologisches Jahrbuch (1886, part 4), 177;
 (1887, part 1), 117; (part 2), 251.
 Archiv für Lateinische Lexikographie (iv. 1),
 121; iv. 2), 288.
 Athenaeum (29 Jan.—19 Mar.), 83; 26 Mar.—
 9 Apr.), 117, 178; (30 Apr.), 178; (7 May),
 177, 178; (21 May—4 June), 212; 25 June—
 13 Aug.), 254; (17 Sept.—15 Oct.), 288; (22
 Oct.—12 Nov.), 319.

Summaries of Periodicals (*continued*)—

Athenische Mittheilungen (1886, part 4), 177;
 (1887, parts 1, 2), 251.
 Berliner philologische Wochenschrift (1 Jan.—
 5 Feb.), 28; (12 Feb.—5 Mar.), 180.
 Bezzenberger's Beiträge zur Kunde der Indo-
 germanischen Sprachen (vol. xii. part 3), 87.
 Blackwood (Mar.), 82, 84; (May), 179.
 Blätter für das Bayer. Gymnasialschulwesen
 (vol. xxiii. Heft. 1), 120; (Heft 2, 3), 179.
 Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique (Jan.—
 Mar.), 177; (Apr.), 211; (May—Nov.), 252.
 Bullettino della Commissione Archeologica Com-
 munale di Roma (parts 1-4), 177; (parts 5-8),
 252.
 Church Quarterly Review (Jan.), 84.
 English Historical Review (Jan.), 84; (no. 8), 319.
 Ἐφημερίς ἀρχαιολογική (1886, part 4), 177; (1887,
 part 1), 250, 252.
 Evening Standard (11 Mar.), 83.
 Expositor (Jan.—Feb.), 30; (Mar.), 84; (Apr.—
 May), 179; (June), 212; (July—Nov.), 319.
 Gazette Archéologique (Jan.—Feb.), 177; (Mar.—
 June), 252; (1887, Paris), 318.
 des Beaux Arts (May), 177.
 Hermathena (no. xiii.), 253.
 Hermes (vol. xxii. part 1), 85; (part 2), 212;
 (part 3), 319.
 Jahrbuch des k. deutschen Arch. Inst. (1887,
 part 3), 286.
 Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der classischen
 Alterthumswissenschaft (14th ser. 1886, nos.
 1-3, vols. xlv. xlviii.), 84.
 Journal of Education (Feb.), 84; (June), 212.
 of Hellenic Studies (1887, vol. viii. no. 1), 253.
 of Philology (no. xxx.), 30; (no. xxxi.), 253.
 of the British and American Archaeological
 Society of Rome (vol. i. 3), 253.
 Kuhn's Zeitschrift (xxix. nos. 1, 2), 259; (nos.
 3, 4), 322.
 Leipziger Studien (ix. 1, 2), 86.
 Les Musées d'Athènes (parts 1, 2), 250.
 Longman's Magazine (Mar.), 82.
 Macmillan's Magazine (Oct.), 288.
 Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique (tome vi.
 fasc. 2), 120.
 Mnemosyne (Nova Series, xv. part 1), 27; (part
 2), 179.
 Museo Italiano di Antichità Classica (vol. ii. part
 2), 287.
 Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie u. Pädagogik
 (part 1), 86; (part 2), 179; (parts 3, 4), 288.
 Nineteenth Century (Mar.), 84; (Apr.), 117;
 (May), 179.
 Numismatic Chronicle (vol. vii. third series, parts
 1, 2), 253.
 Philological Association, Transactions of the
 American (vol. xvii. Boston, 1887), 254.
 Society, Abstract of Proceedings of the (5
 Nov. 1886—18 Mar. 1887), 179.
 Philologische Rundschau (nos. 1-9), 290.
 Philologischer Anzeiger (6 Jan.), 29; (vol. xvii.
 parts 2, 3), 257.
 Philologus (vol. xlv. part 1), 29; (part 2), 289.
 Quarterly (no. 327), 84.
 Register zur Archäologische Zeitung (Jahrg. i.-
 xliii.), 177.
 Revue Archéologique (Jan., Feb.), 177; (Mar.,
 Apr.), 211; (May, June), 251; (July,
 Aug.), 287.
 critique (1887, Jan.—Aug.), 290.
 Égyptologique (4 ann. nos. iii. iv.), 119.
 numismatique (1887, 3rd series, vol. v. part
 1), 87; (part 2), 253.

Summaries of Periodicals (*continued*)—

- Rheinisches Museum (vol. xlii. part 1), 28 ; (part 2), 213 ; (part 3), 289.
 Rivista di Filologica e d'Istruzione Classica (Anno xv. Fasc. 1, 2, 1886), 181 ; (Fasc. 7-12), 322.
 Romanische Forschungen (Band i. 1883) ; (Band ii. Heft. 2, 1885) ; (Band ii. Heft. 3, 1886) ; (Band iii. Heft 1, 1886) ; (Band iii. Heft 2, 1887), 180.
 Römische Mittheilungen (1887, part 1), 177 ; (part 2), 251 ; (part 3), 386.
 Saturday Review (9 Apr.), 117.
 Scottish Review (Jan.), 84 ; (Apr.), 179.
 Scribner's Magazine (Feb.), 84.
 Stade's Zeitschrift f. d. Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft (Heft 1), 181.
 Theologisch Tijdschrift (xxi. 1, Jan.), 119 ; (xxi. 2, Mar.), 181 ; (xxi. 3, May), 259 ; (xxi. 4, July), 291.
 Theologischer Literaturzeitung (29 Jan. — 12 Mar.), 87 ; (26 Mar.—9 Apr.), 259.
 Times (3 Jan.), 81 ; (30 Mar., 7 Apr.), 117 ; (9 Apr.), 117 ; (27 Apr.), 205 ; (4 May), 177.
 Wochenschrift für Klassische Philologie (1 Jan.—9 Mar.), 120 ; (16 Mar.—18 May), 256 ; (25 May—7 Sept.), 320.
 Zeitschrift der Deutsche Morgenländ. Gesellsch. (Band xiv. Heft. 1-3), 120.
 für das Gymnasialwesen (Jan.), 29 ; (Feb.), 119 ; (July, Aug.), 290.
 für Numismatik (vol. xiv. 1887, parts 3, 4), 119 ; (vol. xv. parts 2, 3, 1887), 318.
 für oesterr. Gymnasien (xxxviii. Heft. 1), 85 ; (Heft 2), 180 ; (Heft 3-5), 255 ; (Heft 6), 256.
 Supplementum to Plautus' *Aulularia*, by T. G. Tucker, 310 foll.
suspicio, orthography of, 74*b*.
Syntaxe Latine, Riemann's, 201.
 Syracuse, Jordan and Haverfield's Relief Map of, 73.
ταχύς, etymology of, 87*a*.
 Tacitus, Godley's, 154.
 Person's, *ib*.
ταλαύρινος, 36*b*.
τᾶμον (Homeric τῆμος), 92*a*.
ταναύπους, 36*b*.
 Taylor's *Alphabet*, 93*b*, 315*a*.
 Tell-el-Yahoudeh, necropolis of (*Academy*, 23 Apr.), 177*a*.
τηλύγετος (cp. *τηλέπυλος*), 36*a*.
Terruncius, 320*b*.
thākos and *thākoi* distinguished, 54*a.n*.
 Thasiote Tombs, 210-11 ; 318*a*.
 Thayer's edition of Grimm's Wilke's *Clavis Novi Testamenti*, 106 foll.
θεν (ἐμέθεν, σέθεν, *φέθεν*), 37*a*.
 Theocritus the probable author of one of the *Carmina Figurata*, 304*a*.
 Theodulf of Orleans, Bible of, 147*a*.
 Theophrastus *περί εὐσεβείας*, 186*b.n*.
 Thera, vases from, 20*b*.
θέρσος Θεοσίτης, 36*b*.
θέσις, *ὑπόθεσις*, 222*a*, 224*a*.
 Thessalian inscriptions, Homeric words in, 92*a*.
 Thomas' Cicero, *de Suppliciis* ; *de Signis*, 72.
 Thompson's (E. Maunde) proposed scheme for a catalogue of Greek and Latin MSS., 217-18.
 notice of Chatelain's *Paléographie des Classiques Latins*, 230-1.
 Early Classical MSS. in British Museum, 38 foll.,
 Palaeography in France, 145 foll.

Thompson's (E. Maunde)—*continued*.

- (W. H.) appendices on the 'Erotic discourses of Socrates,' and 'The Philosophy of Isocrates,' 35.
Gorgias and *Phaedrus*, 34.
 'Introductory remarks' on the *Philebus*, *ib*.
 notes to Archer Butler's lectures, 33.
 paper on the *Sophist*, *ib*.
 Thrasymachus of Chalcedon, 223*a*.
θριαμβεύω, 108*b*.
 Thucydides, Book I., Geare's notes on, 231.
 Tibullus and Propertius, Ramsay's selections, 276.
 Tillemont, 266*a*.
tintinabulum, orthography of, 74*b*.
 Tironian shorthand, 231*b*.
 Tiryns, excavations at, 318*a*.
 Tischendorf on the *Codex Palatinus*, 281*a*.
titulus, etymology of, 78-9.
 Torr's (Cecil) Catalogue of Classical antiquities in Harrow School Museum, 285-6.
 Rhodes in Modern Times, 249.
 note on British Museum Department of Oriental antiquities, 119.
 note on Excavations at Sidon, 117*a*.
 note on the Mausoleum, 79*b*.
 note on the Scarabaeus from Ialysos, 250*a*.
 notice of Klein's *Die Griechischen Vasen mit Meistersignaturen*, 176.
 notice of the *Antike Denkmäler*, 250-1.
 notice of Tümpel's *Die Aithiopenländer des Andromedamythos*, 318-19.
 obituary notice of J. H. W. Henzen, 178.
 Tozer's (H. F.) notice of Cecil Torr's *Rhodes in Modern Times*, 249.
 notice of Three Books of Travel in Greece, 237-8.
 review of Shilleto's Pausanias' *Description of Greece*, and Kalkmann's Pausanias der Perieget, 101 foll.
τρι- in compounds, 131*b*.
 Trieste, excavations at, 318.
τρόλις, 13*b*, 92*a*.
 Tucker's (T. G.) communications to the *Cambridge Philological Society*, 24*b*.
 note on *ἄστός* and *αὐτός*, 280*a*.
 Supplementum to Plautus' *Aulularia*, 310 foll.
τυῖδε, 35*b*.
 Tyrrell's (R. Y.) *Aristophanica*, 128 : cp. note on 313.
 Cicero's letters, 66 foll.
 notice of Verrall's *Seven against Thebes*, 50 foll.
 Van Leeuwen and Da Costa's *Der Dialect der homerischen Gedichte*, 199.
 Varro, facsimile of MS., 231*a*.
 Vases from Kalymnos, 80.
 from Thera, 20*b*.
ve in Greek, 309*a*.
 Vergil's *Aeneid*, order of composition, 181*a.b*.
 Bucolica Georgica Aeneis, Güthling's, 276.
 Epigram, *Quis deus, Octavi*,...306-7.
 facsimile of MSS., 231*b*.
 Georgicon Libri iii., iv., Sidgwick's, 153.
 Verner's Law, 104*b*, 105*a.n*.
 Verrall's (A. W.) *Seven against Thebes*, reviewed by Tyrrell, 50 foll.
 notice of Jebb's Sophocles—Part II. the Oedipus Coloneus, 53 foll.
 notice of some School editions of Greek Plays, 132 foll.
Verrianiſche Forschungen, Reitzenstein's, 307-8.
Vie des Mots, Darmesteter's, 161.
 Villard de Hannecourt, 147*a*.
 Vincent, Dr., 270*b*.
Virgilio Maronis Grammatici Opera, Huemer's, 158.

- Vitalis' (Ordericus) *Historia Ecclesiastica*, 147.
 Vitruvius' ground-plan of a Greek Theatre, 296b.
 -*ulcus*, -*culum*, -*bulum*, &c., 'diminutives falsely so called,' 288a.
 Ulrichs' *Cupressi*, 161a.
ul-s = *out*, 87a.
ὑμεις, ὑμῖ, ὑμε, 35b., 37a.
 University Intelligence :—
 Cambridge : 23, 77, 90, 171, 184, 209, 215, 285, 314, 324.
 Dublin : 115, 171, 247.
 Oxford : 21, 77, 89, 171, 183, 208, 215, 285, 314, 324.
 Universities, Greek and Latin Classics v. English Literature in English, 8 foll., 83.
 Laurie's Lectures on the History of, 113.
 Volo, excavations at, 83.
 Von Gutschmidt, Dr. Hermann Alf., 178.
 Schröder, 105b.
Vormundschaft nach Attischen Recht, Schulthess', 165.
vertit, *vertit*, Prof. Key on, 148b.
 Upcott's *Introduction to Greek Sculpture*, 74.
urbanitas of Roman Eloquence, 274a.
 Urwick's *Cremer's Biblico-Theological Lexicon to New Testament Greek*, 106 foll.
 Usener's *Altgriechischer Versbau*, 162-3.
 Ussing and Madvig's *Livy* (4th edition, vol. ii., pars. i.), 276-7.
 Wackernagel on the Greek accent, 103-4.
 Wagerer's *Festi breviarium rerum gestarum populi Romani*, 158.
 Warr's (G. C.) *Dedication, Echoes of Hellas*, 309.
 experiments in Archaic metre, 168.
 'the Aeolic element in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*,' 35 foll., 91 foll.
 note on Aesch. *Eum.* (631f.), 313a.
 notice of Usener's *Altgriechischer Versbau*, 162-3.
 Watkin's (Thompson) works on Cheshire and Lancashire, 300a.
 Way's (Lewis) *Odyssey*, 159-60.
 Wayte's review of Paley and Sandys' *Demosthenes*, 14-15.
 Weil's *Les Plaidoyers Politiques de Demosthène*, 218 foll.
 Welldon's *Aristotle's Rhetoric*, 98 foll.
 Wendland's *Quaestiones Musonianae*, 74-5.
 Wetstein's *Notes to the Greek Testament*, 74a.
 Weymouth's *Resultant Greek Testament*, 70.
 Wharton (E. R.) on *titulus*, 79a.
 Wheeler, B. J., *Der Griechische Nominal-Accent*, 103 foll.
 Wheeler's (J. H.) collation of a MS. of Persius, 17b.
 Whewell (Dr.) on the authorship of the *Sophist* and *Politicus*, 33.
 Whibley's (L.) notice of Beloch's *Die Bevölkerung der griechisch-römischen Welt*, 164.
 Whitelaw's papers in the *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, 133b.
 Wiel on the Orphic poems, 270b.
 Wilcken's test of *opisthographi*, 320b.
 Wilkinson's (Sir Gardner) collection of Egyptian and Classical Antiquities in Harrow School Museum, 285-6.
 Wilkins' (A. S.) note on *ceraria*—*toraria* (Plaut. *Mil. Glor.* 695), 79b.
 note on ἐπισημασία (Cic. *ad Att.* I. xvi. 11 ; XIV. iii. 2), *ib.*
 notice of Stöbile's and Cima's Cicero, *de Oratore*, 306.
 notice of Arnold's *Second Punic War* (edited by W. T. Arnold), 109-10.
 notice of Engelhardt's *Latin Conjugation*, 147 foll.
 notice of Windisch's *Georg Curtius. Ein Charakteristik*, 263 foll.
 Windisch's *Georg Curtius. Ein Charakteristik*, 263.
 Wölflin's *Archiv*, 121b., 139a., 227-8.
 Woods and Johnston's translation of three Anti-Pelagian Treatises of S. Augustine, 235.
 Wordsworth's (Bishop) Letter to a Friend on some faults in Milton's Latin Poetry, 46 foll.
 (Chr.) notice of Laurie's Lectures on the Rise and Early Constitution of Universities, 113.
 notice of Herford's *Studies in the Literary Records of England and Germany in the Sixteenth Century*, 166.
 notice of Sicard's *Études classiques avant la Révolution*, 167.
 Wroth's (W.) notice of Baumeister's *Denkmäler*, 202-3.
 Wyse's (W.) notice of Martin's *Les Cavaliers Athéniens*, 228 foll.
 'Young Grammarians,' School of the, 147a., 264b.
 ζα- (= δια), 35b.
 ζαῆν (*Od.* xii. 313), 36a.
 Zeller's *Ueber die Unterscheidung einer doppelten Gestalt der Ideenlehre in der platonischen Schriften*, 232-3.
 Zimmern's (Alice) revision of Jeremy Collier's *Marcus Aurelius*, 232.
 Zingerle's *Ovidii Metamorphoses*, 157.
 Livy i.-ii., xxi.-xxii., with Selections from Books iii., iv., vi., 277.
 Zompolides' *Course of Modern Greek*, 113.

PA
1
C7
v.1

The Classical review

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY
